arXiv:1610.04944v1 [math.AG] 17 Oct 2016

The Adherence Order on Renner-Coxeter Monoids

Allen O'Hara

January 2016

Abstract

Building upon the previous Renner-Coxeter system of work by Eddy Godelle we introduce the familiar Renner monoid structure of the Adherence order. The Green's relations of the system are then considered in relation to the Adherence order and in the finite case maximum and minimum elements in each equivalence class are distinguished and studied.

1 Coxeter Systems and Double Cosets

Renner monoids are a much studied combinatorial object coming from reductive algebraic monoids. Named after Lex Renner, they are derived from reductive algebraic monoids by means of the Bruhat decomposition ([6]). They occupy a position in the theory of reductive monoids analgous to the Weyl groups in the Bruhat decomposition for reductive algebraic groups.

As the title might suggest, we will be considering not just Renner monoids, but a generalization of Renner monoids called Renner-Coxeter monoids. Renner-Coxeter monoids are to Renner monoids what Coxeter groups are to Weyl groups. As such, it will benefit us greatly to review some of the important results in the study of Coxeter groups. Many of these results can be found in [1] by Bjorner and Brenti, or are simple consequences of results from that source.

Definition 1.1. *A* **Coxeter system** *consists of a pair* (W, S) *where*

(i) W *is a group generated by* S

(ii) there exists a function $m : S^2 \to \{1, 2, \cdots, \infty\}$ *so that,*

$m(s,t) = m(t,s)$ *for all* $s, t \in S$

$m(s,t) = 1$ *if and only if* $s = t$

W *has the presentation* $\langle S \mid (st)^{m(s,t)}$ *for all* $s, t \in S$ *with* $m(s,t) \neq \infty \rangle$

The function m is often referred to as the **Coxeter matrix**. The group, W, will be referred to as the **Coxeter group** and S will be termed the set of **generators** or **simple reflections**.

Theorem 1.2. *Define a function, $\ell : W \to \mathbb{N}$ called the* **length** *function by, $\ell(w) = k$ where k is minimum such that there exists an expression, $w = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_k$ with each $s_i \in S$. Any expression $w = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{\ell(w)}$ with each $s_i \in S$ is called a* **reduced word** *expression for w.*

(1) $\ell(w^{-1}) = \ell(w)$

(2) $\ell(sw) = \ell(w) \pm 1$

(3) Two reduced words for u must contain the exactly same generators, but possibly in different amounts and arrangements.

(4) Any expression for an element $w \in W$, contains a reduced word expression for w as a subword.

(5) W is finite if and only if there is a unique element of maximum length, which is denoted w_0 and called the **longest element** *of W.*

(6) For any $u \in W$, $\ell(w_0 u) = \ell(w_0) - \ell(u) = \ell(u w_0)$

(7) $w_0^2 = 1$

Proof. (1) Proposition 1.4.2 (iv) in [1].

(2) Proposition 1.4.2 (iii) in [1].

(3) Corollary 1.4.8(ii) in [1].

(4) Corollary 1.4.8(i) in [1].

(5) Proposition 2.3.1 in [1].

(6) Proposition 2.3.2 (ii) in [1].

(7) Proposition 2.3.2 (i) in [1]. □

Theorem 1.3. *Let $u, v \in W$. We define the relation $u \leq v$ if and only if there is a reduced word expression, $v = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_m$ and a reduced word expression $u = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_n}$ with $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n \leq m$. This relation is known as the* **Bruhat order** *and it has (among others) the follow properties.*

(1) $\leq$ is a partial order on W.

(2) $u \leq v$ if and only if every reduced word for v has a subword that is a reduced word for u.

(3) $u \leq v \Rightarrow \ell(u) \leq \ell(v)$

(4) $u \leq v \Rightarrow u^{-1} \leq v^{-1}$

(5) If W is finite then $u \leq v \Leftrightarrow w_0 v \leq w_0 u$

(6) If W is finite then $w \leq w_0$ for all $w \in W$.

(7) Suppose $u \leq v$ and $s \in S$. If $m = max\{v, sv\}$, $su \leq m$

(8) Suppose $u \leq v$ and $s \in S$. If $m = max\{v, vs\}$, $us \leq m$

(9) If $u < v$ there exists a chain $u = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_k = v$ such that $\ell(x_i) = \ell(u) + i$ for all i.

(10) The **Bruhat interval**, $[u, v] := \{w \in W \mid u \leq w \leq v\}$ *is always finite. Indeed,* $|[u, v]| \leq 2^{\ell(v)}$.

(11) Suppose $u \leq v$, $x \leq y$ and $\ell(vy) = \ell(v) + \ell(y)$, then $ux \leq vy$

Proof. (1) The properties of a partial order are clear from our definition.

(2) This is part of Corollary 2.2.3 in [1].

(3) $\ell(u) = n \leq i_n \leq m = \ell(v)$

(4) Follows from the fact that if $s_1 \cdots s_k$ is a reduced word for w then $s_k \cdots s_1$ is a reduced word for w.

(5) (i) in Proposition 2.3.4 of [1]

(6) This is due to Proposition 2.3.1 in [1] and property (3) above.

(7) This is a quick consequence of the lifting property, Theorem 2.2.7 in [1]. The lifting property is a very important result which we will use in many proofs.

(8) Similar to (7).

(9) Theorem 2.2.6 in [1].

(10) Corollary 2.2.4 in [1].

(11) Since u is a subword of v and x is a subword of y it makes sense that a word for ux is contained in a reduced word for vy. It follows that a reduced word for ux is contained in a reduced word for vy. □

Theorem 1.4. *For a subset of generators, $I \subseteq S$ we denote by W_I the subgroup of W generated by I. A subgroup obtained in this way is called a* **standard parabolic subgroup**. *There is a one to one correspondence between standard parabolic subgroups and subsets of S.*

Let $I, J \subseteq S$, and let $w \in W$ be arbitrary. We define ${}^I W^J = \{u \in W \mid u \leq v, \forall v \in W_I u W_J\}$ as the set of minimum coset representatives for I and J. Every double coset has a minimum element, and for w, we denote the minimum element of $W_I w W_J$ by ${}^I w^J$.

When $I = \emptyset$ we will often refer to W^J and w^J, and when $J = \emptyset$ we will often refer to ${}^I W$ and ${}^I w$.

(1) $w \in {}^I W^J$ if and only if no reduced word for w begins with a generator from I or ends with a generator from J.

(2) ${}^I w^J = {}^I(w^J) = ({}^I w)^J$

(3) For any $u, v \in W$, $u \leq v$ implies ${}^I u^J \leq {}^I v^J$

(4) ${}^I W^J = {}^I W \cap W^J$

(5) For any $u \in W$, $\left({}^I u^J\right)^{-1} = {}^I\left(u^{-1}\right)^J$

(6) For any $u, v \in W$, if $u = {}^I u^J$ then $u \leq v$ if and only if $u \leq w$ for all $w \in W_I v W_J$

(7) If $w \in {}^I W^J$ and $w' \in W_I w W_J$ then there exist $u \in W_I$, $v \in W_J$ so that $w' = uwv$ and $\ell(w') = \ell(u) + \ell(w) + \ell(v)$.

(8) Suppose that $u \leq v \in W$ and $v \in W^I$. If $w \in W_I$ then $uw \leq vw$.

(9) Suppose that $u \leq v \in W$ and $v \in {}^I W$. If $w \in W_I$ then $wu \leq wv$.

(10) Suppose $a, b \in W^I$ and $x, y \in W_I$ with $ax \leq by$. Then we can find $u, v \in W_I$ so that $x = uv$, $\ell(x) = \ell(u) + \ell(v)$ and $au \leq b$, $v \leq y$.

(11) Suppose $a, b \in {}^I W$ and $x, y \in W_I$ with $xa \leq yb$. Then we can find $u, v \in W_I$ so that $x = vu$, $\ell(x) = \ell(v) + \ell(u)$ and $ua \leq b$, $v \leq y$.

Proof. (1) Pick any $u \in W$. Pick any minimal element $v \in W_I u W_J$. Then it is clear that $v < sv$ and $v < vt$ for any $s \in I$, $t \in J$. So then no reduced word for v can start with an element of I or end with an element of J. Consider

another element in $W_I u W_J$ with this property (it could be another minimal element, so this proof will also show us that each double coset does indeed have a minimum). Let this element be $v' \in W_I u W_J$.

We can find elements $x, x' \in W_I$ and $y, y' \in W_J$ so that $v = xuy$ and $v' = x'uy'$. Let $x'x^{-1} = a_1 \cdots a_m$, $a_i \in I$ and $y^{-1}y' = b_1 \cdots b_n$, $b_j \in J$ be reduced words. Then $v' = x'uy' = x'x^{-1}vy^{-1}y' = a_1 \cdots a_m v b_1 \cdots b_n$. By applying the lifting property $m + n$ many times we then see that $v' \leq v$. By minimality of v, we have $v = v'$.

(2) Consider $x = w^J$ and $y = {}^I x$. By Lemma 2.4.3 in [1] we can find $u \in W_I$ so that $x = uy$ and $\ell(x) = \ell(u) = \ell(y)$. It is clear by (1) that no reduced word for y starts with a generator from I. Suppose there is a reduced word for y ending with $s \in J$. Then taking any reduced word for u we can construct a reduced word for x ending in s, a contradiction. So by (1) tells us that ${}^I w^J = y = {}^I x = {}^I(w^J)$. Similarly, we can show that ${}^I w^J = ({}^I w)^J$.

(3) It is clear that ${}^I u^J \leq u \leq v$. Since ${}^I v^J \in W_I v W_J$ we can find $a_1, \cdots, a_m \in I$ and $b_1, \cdots, b_n \in J$ so that ${}^I v^J = a_m \cdots a_1 v b_1 \cdots b_n$.

For each $i = 1, \cdots, m$, let $x_i = a_i x_{i-1}$, starting with $v = x_0$. Notice that ${}^I u^J \leq x_0$. Suppose ${}^I u^J \leq x_i$. Then either $x_{i+1} < x_i$ or $x_i < x_{i+1}$. In the former case, the lifting property guarantees that ${}^I u^J \leq x_{i+1}$ whereas in the latter, we see that ${}^I u^J \leq x_i < x_{i+1}$. So by induction ${}^I u^J \leq x_m$.

For each $i = 1, \cdots, m$, let $y_j = y_{j-1} b_j$, starting with $x_m = y_0$. Notice that ${}^I u^J \leq y_0$ by the preceeding paragraph. Suppose ${}^I u^J \leq y_j$. Then either $y_{j+1} < y_j$ or $y_j < y_{j+1}$. In the former case, the lifting property guarantees that ${}^I u^J \leq y_{j+1}$ whereas in the latter, we see that ${}^I u^J \leq y_i < y_{j+1}$. So by induction ${}^I u^J \leq y_n = {}^I v^J$.

(4) follows from (1) by considering reduced words.

(5) also follows from (1) by considering reduced words.

(6) $u \leq v$ implies $u = {}^I u^J \leq {}^I v^J \leq w$ for all $w \in W_I v W_J$ by definition of ${}^I v^J$. Conversely, if $u \leq w$ for all $w \in W_I v W_J$ then $u \leq v$.

(7) Lemma 2.4.3 in [1] notes that in the W^I and ${}^I W$ cases this decomposition exists and is unique. Let $x \in W_I w W_J$. Then we can decompose $x = py$ with $\ell(x) = \ell(p) + \ell(y)$ and $y = {}^I w$. Then let $y = qr$ with $\ell(y) = \ell(q) + \ell(r)$ and $q \in W^J$. By (2) then $q = {}^I x^J$ and $\ell(x) = \ell(p) + \ell(y) = \ell(p) + \ell(q) + \ell(r)$ as desired.

(8) Notice that $\ell(vw) = \ell(v) + \ell(w)$. As was remarked for the preceeding result, [1] notes that this decomposition is unique. So let $w = s_1 \cdots s_{\ell(w)}$ be a reduced word decomposition for w. Then, since $u \leq v$ the resuilt follows by $\ell(w)$ applications of the lifting property.

(9) This is shown simiarly to (8).

(10) Write out $by = s_1 \cdots s_m t_1 \cdots t_n$ where $s_1 \cdots s_m = b$ and $t_1 \cdots t_n = y$. We know that since $ax \leq by$ we can find a reduced subword, $ax = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k} t_{j_1} \cdots t_{j_\ell}$. Within this we can find a reduced word for a. But since $y \in W_I$ all $t_i \in I$ and since $a \in W^I$ no reduced word can end in I. Thus $a \leq s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k}$. Let $v = t_{j_1} \cdots t_{j_\ell}$ and let $u = a^{-1} a x v^{-1}$. Then it is clear that $au = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k} \leq b$ and $v \leq y$. Furthermore, by comparing lengths we can see that $x = uv$ with $\ell(x) = \ell(u) + \ell(v)$.

(11) Done similar to (10). □

Theorem 1.5. *In Chapter 3 of [1] two new relations on W, related to the Bruhat order are defined. For $u, v \in W$ we say $u \leq_L v$ if and only if there exists $w \in W$ so that $v = wu$ with $\ell(v) = \ell(w) + \ell(u)$ and we say $u \leq_R v$ if and*

only if there exists $w \in W$ so that $v = uw$ with $\ell(v) = \ell(u) + \ell(w)$. These two relations are called the **left** *and* **right weak orders** *respectively.*

(1) Both $\leq_L$ and $\leq_R$ are partial orders on W.

(2) $u \leq_R v \Leftrightarrow \ell(v) = \ell(u) + \ell(u^{-1}v)$ and $u \leq_L v \Leftrightarrow \ell(v) = \ell(u) + \ell(vu^{-1})$

(3) $u \leq_L v \Rightarrow u \leq v$, $u \leq_R v \Rightarrow u \leq v$

(4) Suppose that W is finite. Then for any $w \in W$, $w \leq_L w_0$ and $w \leq_R w_0$

(5) Suppose $u \leq v$, $y \leq x$ and $x^{-1} \leq_L u$. Then $ux \leq vy$

(6) Suppose $v \leq u$, $x \leq y$ and $u^{-1} \leq_R x$. Then $ux \leq vy$

(7) Take $I \subseteq S$ and suppose W is finite. For any $u \in W^I$, $v \in W_{w_0 I w_0} w_0 W_I$, $u \leq_L v$

(8) Take $I \subseteq S$ and suppose W is finite. For any $u \in {}^I W$, $v \in W_I w_0 W_{w_0 I w_0}$, $u \leq_R v$

Proof. (1) Clear by the definition of our weak orders.

(2) (ii) in Proposition 3.1.2 of [1].

(3) Is clear by definition of $\leq$ as u is definitely a subword of v.

(4) (iii) in Proposition 3.1.2 of [1].

(5) Consider $x = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_\ell$ as a reduced word. We will prove the result by induction on ℓ. For $\ell = 0$, $x = y = 1$ and we already know that $u \leq v$, so $ux \leq vy$. Assume the result is true for all $\ell \leq k$ and suppose that $\ell(x) = k + 1$. Notice that $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_k = x s_{k+1} < x$ and also $(x s_{k+1})^{-1} \leq_L u$ as well. Consider $y s_{k+1}$. By the lifting property we have either $y \leq x s_{k+1}$ or $y \not\leq x s_{k+1}$ and $y s_{k+1} \leq x s_{k+1}$.

If $y \leq x s_{k+1}$ then $u(x s_{k+1}) \leq vy$ by induction and it follows that $ux = u(x s_{k+1}) s_{k+1} < u(x s_{k+1}) \leq vy$. If $y \not\leq x s_{k+1}$ and $y s_{k+1} \leq x s_{k+1}$ then by induction $u(x s_{k+1}) \leq v(y s_{k+1})$. By applying the lifting property it can be quickly shown that $ux = u(x s_{k+1}) s_{k+1} \leq v(y s_{k+1}) s_{k+1} = vy$.

(6) Similar to (5).

(7) First notice that for any $s \in S$ $\ell(w_0 s w_0) = \ell(w_0) - \ell(s w_0) = \ell(w_0) - (\ell(w_0) - \ell(s)) = \ell(s) = 1$, so $w_0 s w_0$ is a generator. Thus, $w_0 I w_0 \subseteq S$ and so our statement makes sense.

Consider any element $v = a w_0 b \in W_{w_0 I w_0} w_0 W_I$. Then we can write $a = s_1 \cdots s_k$ and $b = t_1 \cdots t_\ell$ as reduced words. So, $a w_0 b = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_k w_0 t_1 t_2 \cdots t_\ell = w_0 s_1' w_0 w_0 s_2' w_0 \cdots w_0 s_k' w_0 w_0 t_1 t_2 \cdots t_\ell = w_0 s_1' s_2' \cdots s_k' t_1 t_2 \cdots t_\ell$ with all the s_i' and t_k being simple reflections in I. So $a w_0 b \in w_0 W_I$ and indeed, we can even show $W_{w_0 I w_0} w_0 = W_{w_0 I w_0} w_0 W_I = w_0 W_I$ by symmetry. It follows that ${}^{w_0 I w_0} w_0 = {}^{w_0 I w_0} w_0^I = w_0^I$.

Let $u \in W^I$. By (4) we can see that $u w_0(I) \leq_L w_0 = w_0^I w_0(I)$. By Proposition 3.1.2(vi) in [1] it follows that $u \leq_L w_0^I$. For any $v \in W_{w_0 I w_0} w_0 W_I$ we can write $v = x^{w_0 I w_0} w_0$, so $w_0^I = {}^{w_0 I w_0} w_0 \leq_L v$. Since $\leq_L$ is a partial order, transitivity lets us conclude that $u \leq_L v$.

(8) Similar to (7). □

These results are meant to highlight the important properties from Coxeter group theory which will permeate all our later results. There are other results we will need, which will be invoked at the time. Those wishing a

much more complete understanding of the Bruhat order and minimum coset representatives are encouraged to read Chapters 1 and 2 of [1].

2 Renner-Coxeter Systems

In his paper, [2], Eddy Godelle made an excellent definition that went beyond the usual Renner monoid derived from reductive monoids in algebraic geometry. Taking the basic structures of the Renner monoid from reductive monoids he created a whole collection of factorizable monoids with similar, simple, and robust structure.

A factorizable monoid is one which is unit regular ($M = E(M)G(M) = G(M)E(M)$) and its set of idempotents is a meet semilattice with the partial order $e \leq f \Leftrightarrow ef = fe = e$. Factorizable monoids are known to be inverse monoids. That is, every element $m \in M$ has a unique element, n, called the inverse of m, so that $mnm = m$ and $nmn = n$.

Definition 2.1. *A* **generalized Renner-Coxeter system** *is a triple* $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$ *such that,*

(i) $\mathcal{R}$ *is a factorizable monoid, whose group of units we will denote by* W

(ii) Λ *is a transversal of* $E(\mathcal{R})$ *for the action of* W *and a sub-meet semilattice*

(iii) (W, S) *is a Coxeter system*

(iv) for every pair $e \leq e' \in E(\mathcal{R})$*, there exists* $w \in W$ *and* $f \leq f' \in \Lambda$ *so that* $wew^{-1} = f$ *and* $we'w^{-1} = f'$

(v) the map $\lambda^* : \Lambda \to P(S)$ *given by* $\lambda^*(e) = \{s \in S \mid se = es \neq e\}$ *satisfies* $e \leq f \Rightarrow \lambda^*(e) \subseteq \lambda^*(f)$

(vi) for every $e \in \Lambda$*, the groups,* $\{w \in W \mid we = ew\}$ *and* $\{w \in W \mid we = ew = e\}$*, are standard parabolic subgroups of* W

In Godelle's paper he refers to the monoid, $\mathcal{R}$ as a *g*eneralized Renner monoid, however in this paper we will refer to $\mathcal{R}$ as a **Renner-Coxeter monoid** as it is a little more clear at a glance that we are talking about a monoid described by the above system rather than the more familiar Renner monoids from reductive monoids with which we will occasionally contrast. We shall call Λ the **cross-sectional lattice** and S again as the set of **generators** or the set of **simple reflections**.

For the remainder of this paper, $\mathcal{R}$ will always represent a Renner-Coxeter monoid, W will always be its group of units, S its generators, Λ the cross-sectional lattice, and so on. Any other assumptions on these basic structures will be stated during results that require them.

In [2], Godelle covers three different examples showing that Renner monoids derived from reductive algebraic monoids (Example 1.7 in [2]), abstract monoids of finite Lie type (Example 1.8 in [2]), and Kac-Moody groups over fields of characteristic 0 (Example 1.9 in [2]) are all Renner-Coxeter systems. This allows our work to cover much more than just reductive monoid results, although later we will make an assumption of finiteness aimed at examining those Renner monoids more specifically.

As they are parabolic subgroups of W, we can define maps $\lambda : \Lambda \to P(S)$ and $\lambda_* : \Lambda \to P(S)$ so that $\{w \in W \mid we = ew\} = W_{\lambda(e)}$ and $\{w \in W \mid we = ew = e\} = W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ for each $e \in \Lambda$. We term λ, λ_*, and λ^* as the **type**

map, **lower type map**, and **upper type map** respectively. These type maps have a special relationship which will be explored by the next two results.

Lemma 2.2. *For $J \subseteq I \subseteq S$ the following are equivalent*

(1) J and $I\backslash J$ commute

(2) for any $u \in W_{I\backslash J}$ and $v \in W_J$, $uv = vu$

(3) W_J is a normal subgroup of W_I

(4) $W_{I\backslash J}$ is a normal subgroup of W_I

(5) $W_I = W_{I\backslash J} \times W_J$

(6) $W_I = W_J \times W_{I\backslash J}$

Proof. We shall just show (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (5) $\Rightarrow$ (1) and note that (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (4) $\Rightarrow$ (6) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is done similarly, completing the result.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) are clear. For (3) $\Rightarrow$ (5) let $w \in W_I$ with a given reduced word $w = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_\ell$. Define $a_0 = b_0 = 1$. We will build up two elements $a_\ell \in W_{I\backslash J}$ and $b_\ell \in W_J$ so that $w = a_\ell b_\ell$. At step $i \geq 1$, if $s_i \in J$ then let $a_i = a_{i-1} \in W_{I\backslash J}$ and let $b_i = b_{i-1} s_i \in W_J$. If instead, $s_i \in I\backslash J$ then let $a_i = a_{i-1} s_i$ and let $b_i = s_i b_{i-1} s_i \in W_J$ by our normality assumption.

Observe that at each stage, $a_i \in W_{I\backslash J}$, $b_i \in W_J$ and $w = a_i b_i s_{i+1} s_{i+2} \cdots s_\ell$. Thus, after ℓ steps of the process, we have $w = a_\ell b_\ell$. Since w was arbitrary we see that $W_I = W_{I\backslash J} \times W_J$.

For (5) $\Rightarrow$ (1) take $i \in I\backslash J$ and $j \in J$. Either $iji = i$, $iji = j$, or iji is a reduced word. The first case implies $i = j$, a contradiction. The second can rearrange to show $ij = ji$. Our result will be proven if we can just show that iji is not a reduced word.

Clearly, $iji \in W_I$, so $iji = uv$ for some $u \in W_{I\backslash J}$ and $v \in W_J$. Let w be a reduced word subword (recall Theorem 1.2) for uv. Then $w = s_1 \cdots s_k s_{k+1} \cdots s_{\ell(w)}$ where k is such that $s_a \in I\backslash J$ for all $a \leq k$ and $s_a \in J$ for all $k < a$. But two reduced words for the same group element must have the exact same $s \in S$, just in different amounts (Theorem 1.2) so $s_a = i$ for $a \leq k$, $s_a = j$ for $a > k$. Thus, $iji = w = i^k j^{\ell(w)-k}$. Since $\ell(w) = 3$ we either have $iji = iij = j$ or $iji = ijj = i$, both of which show that iji is not a reduced word. □

Proposition 2.3. *For any $e \in \Lambda$, $W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ is a normal subgroup of $W_{\lambda(e)}$.*

Proof. Let $u \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ and $v \in W_{\lambda(e)}$. By definition we know that $ue = e = eu$. Consider vuv^{-1} and notice that $vuv^{-1}e = vuev^{-1} = vev^{-1} = evv^{-1} = e = vv^{-1}e = vev^{-1} = veuv^{-1} = evuv^{-1}$. Thus $vuv^{-1} \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ as desired. □

Since $W_{\lambda_*(e)} \trianglelefteq W_{\lambda(e)}$ we can now use any of the six properties of the preceeding lemma to our advantage. We will make great use later on of facts like $\lambda_*(e)$ and $\lambda^*(e)$ commute and $W_{\lambda(e)} = W_{\lambda_*(e)} \times W_{\lambda^*(e)} = W_{\lambda^*(e)} \times W_{\lambda_*(e)}$.

In addition to introducing the concept of generalized Renner-Coxeter systems, [2] lets us understand the presentation of such systems, introduces a notion of length, and also gives us the following result, of which we will make great use.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that $e, f \in \Lambda$ and $w \in {}^{\lambda(e)}W^{\lambda(f)}$. There is a unique element, $g \in \Lambda$ such that,*

(1) $w \in W_{\lambda_*(g)}$

(2) $ewf = g = fw^{-1}e$

(3) $g = max\{h \in \Lambda \mid h \leq e, h \leq f, w \in W_{\lambda(h)}\}$

This element is denoted, $e \wedge_w f$, and shall be referred to as **Godelle's meet**.

Proof. This is actually two results from [2] written together. (1) and $ewf = g$ follow from Lemma 1.12 and (3) and $g = fw^{-1}e$ are stated as part (iii) of Corollary 1.13. □

Our last piece of introductory monoid material is the following collection of equivalence relations, familiar to nearly anyone who has studied semigroups before.

Definition 2.5. *For any $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$, we recall the following defintions for* **Green's relations**.

(1) $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}r\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}s\mathcal{R}$ if and only if there are $u, v \in W$ so that $s = urv$

(2) $r \mathscr{L} s$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}r = \mathcal{R}s$ if and only if there is $u \in W$ so that $s = ur$

(3) $r \mathscr{R} s$ if and only if $r\mathcal{R} = s\mathcal{R}$ if and only if there is $v \in W$ so that $s = rv$

(4) $r \mathscr{H} s$ if and only if $r \mathscr{L} s$ and $r \mathscr{R} s$ if and only if there are $e, f \in E(\mathcal{R})$ and $u, v \in W$ so that $r = eu = uf$ and $s = ev = vf$

That these are equivalence relations on a monoid is a well known result. Of particular interest are the definitions for the relations in terms of elements of W which come about since $\mathcal{R}$ is by definition a factorizable monoid and hence a unit regular monoid.

Semigroup theorists will notice that the common $\mathscr{D}$ relation is absent in our definition. However, upon closer inspection one can see that $\mathscr{J} = \mathscr{L} \circ \mathscr{R}$ which is the definition of the $\mathscr{D}$ relation.

As we move forward we will be seeing a lot of Green's relations. When we wish to denote a generic relation, we shall often use the $\mathscr{T}$ symbol. To denote a specfic equivalence class, we shall use $T_r = \{s \in \mathcal{R} \mid r \mathscr{T} s\}$ to mean the $\mathscr{T}$-class of the element r.

3 Adherence Orders on Renner-Coxeter Monoids

Our goal is to generalize the Adherence order of Renner monoids from reductive algebraic monoids ([6]). Thanks to excellent work done by Pennell, Putcha, and Renner in [4] the Adherence order between two elements of the Renner monoid can be determined by first decomposing the elements in question in a unique way, known as the standard form decomposition. It turns out (as has been noted by Godelle in his paper) the elements of a Renner-Coxeter monoid can be decomposed similarly. We will use these standard forms in the definition of our Adherence orders.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $r \in \mathcal{R}$.*

(1) There exists a unique set of elements, $x, e, y \in \mathcal{R}$ so that $r = xey$, $e \in \Lambda$, $x \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$, and $y \in {}^{\lambda(e)}W$. When we

write $r = xey$ in this way we say r is written in **left standard form**.

(2) There exists a unique set of elements, $y, e, x \in \mathcal{R}$ so that $r = yex$, $e \in \Lambda$, $x \in {}^{\lambda_*(e)}W$, and $y \in W^{\lambda(e)}$. When we write $r = yex$ in this way we say r is written in **right standard form**.

(3) There exists a unique set of elements, $x, e, y, z \in \mathcal{R}$ so that $r = xeyez$, $e \in \Lambda$, $x \in W^{\lambda(e)}$, $y \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}$, and $z \in {}^{\lambda(e)}W$. When we write $r = xeyez$ in this way we say r is written in **hybrid standard form**.

(4) If $r = xeyez$ is in hybrid standard form, then $r = (xy)ez$ is in left standard form and $r = xe(yz)$ is in right standard form.

Proof. (1) and (2) are Proposition 1.11 in [2].

(3) and (4) Let us take $r = aeb$ to be in left standard form. Since $a \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$ and $W_{\lambda(e)} = W_{\lambda^*(e)} \times W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ is is not hard to see that if $x = a^{\lambda(e)}$ then there exists $y \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}$ so that $a = xy$. Letting $z = b \in {}^{\lambda(e)}W$ we can see that $r = aeb = xyez = xeyez$ satisfies the properties of hybrid standard form.

Suppose $r = xeyez$ satisfies the conditions of hybrid standard form. Since e is an idempotent and $y \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}$ we see that $ye = yee = eye = eey = ey$. So it is clear that $r = xeyez = (xy)ez = xe(yz)$. Since $x \in W^{\lambda(e)}$ and $y \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}$ we can see that $xy \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$, so $(xy)ez$ is in left standard form and similarly $xe(yz)$ is in right standard form.

To show uniqueness, suppose that $r = xeyez = aebec$ are two such decompositions. Then $(xy)ez = (ab)ec$ are in left standard form, which is unique. Thus $z = c$ and $xy = ab$. Then $x = (xy)^{\lambda(e)} = (ab)^{\lambda(e)} = a$ and it follows quickly that $y = b$ as well. □

With our standard forms in hand, we can more easily compare some of Green's relations by observation of the decomposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose $r = xey$ and $s = afb$ are elements of $\mathcal{R}$ written in left standard form. Then,*

(1) $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $e = f$

(2) $r \mathscr{L} s$ if and only if $e = f$ and $y = b$

Suppose $r = xey$ and $s = afb$ are elements of $\mathcal{R}$ written in right standard form. Then,

(3) $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $e = f$

(4) $r \mathscr{R} s$ if and only if $e = f$ and $y = b$

Suppose $r = aebec$ and $s = xfyfz$ are elements of $\mathcal{R}$ written in hybrid standard form. Then,

(5) $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $e = f$

(6) $r \mathscr{L} s$ if and only if $e = f$ and $c = z$

(7) $r \mathscr{R} s$ if and only if $e = f$ and $a = x$

(8) $r \mathscr{H} s$ if and only if $e = f$, $a = x$ and $c = z$

Proof. (1) $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $WrW = WsW$ by definition. Then we see that $WeW = WrW = WsW = WfW$, so $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $e = f$.

(2) $r \mathscr{L} s$ if and only if $Wr = Ws$ by definition. So $r \mathscr{L} s$ if and only if we can find $w \in W$ so that $r = ws$ or rather, $xey = wafb = (wa)^{\lambda_*(f)}fb$. The first and last of these are in left standard form which is unique. So $x = (wa)^{\lambda_*(f)}$, $e = f$, and $y = b$. The converse follows quickly.

(3) and (4) are done similarly to (1) and (2).

(5), (6), and (7) are each covered by previous results thanks to (4) from the preceeding proposition.

(8) follows from applying (6) and (7) and the fact that $r \mathscr{H} s$ if and only if $r \mathscr{L} s$ and $r \mathscr{R} s$. □

(1) in the preceeding shows us that Λ really is cross-sectional with respect to the $\mathscr{J}$-classes of $\mathcal{R}$, earning its name.

Definition 3.3. *Let us define two distinct relations on $\mathcal{R}$ based on our two standard forms. Let $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$ be arbitrary elements.*

(1) If $r = xey$ and $s = afb$ are in left standard form, we say $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $e \leq f$ and there exists an element $w \in W_{\lambda^*(f)} W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ so that $x \leq aw$ and $w^{-1} b \leq y$.

(2) If $r = yex$ and $s = bfa$ are in right standard form, we say $r \leq^- s$ if and only if $e \leq f$ and there exists an element $w \in W_{\lambda_*(e)} W_{\lambda^*(f)}$ so that $x \leq wa$ and $bw^{-1} \leq y$.

These partial orders are referred to as the **Adherence orders** *on* $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$.

Our choice of associating + to the left standard form comes from the historic focus on left standard form ([4]). We will show shortly that the notation, $\leq^+$ and $\leq^-$ is apt, as these are partial orders. But towards the proof we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *For any $u, v \in W$, the following exist and are equal*

(1) $max\{u'v \mid u' \leq u\}$

(2) $max\{uv' \mid v' \leq v\}$

(3) $max\{u'v' \mid u' \leq u, v' \leq v\}$

As a result, we denote this element by $u \circ v$ and, as it produces a maximum with respect to the Bruhat order, it is called the **optimization operator**.

Proof. We are going to show that (1) and (3) exist and are equal by induction on $\ell(u)$. The existence and equality of (2) and (3) follow by a similar argument, completing the result.

Let us induct on $k = \ell(u)$. If $k = 0$ then $u = 1$ and the result is clear. Suppose that $k > 0$. Then we can find $s \in S$ so that $w := su < u$. By induction, $max\{w'v \mid w' \leq w\}$ and $max\{w'v' \mid w' \leq w, v' \leq v\}$ exist and are equal. Let us call them x. Let $m = max\{x, sx\}$. Now it suffices to show that m is the maximum of each of the sets specified in (1) and (3).

(1) We can find $w_1 \leq w$ so that $x = w_1 v$, so $m = w_1 v$ or $sw_1 v$ and since $w_1, sw_1 \leq max\{w, sw\} = u$ we see that $m \in \{u'v \mid u' \leq u\}$. Take any $u' \leq u$. If $su' < u'$, then $su' \leq w$, in which case $su'v \leq x$ and hence $u'v = ssu'v \leq m$. On the other hand, if $u' < su'$, then $u' \leq w$ (by the lifting property), in which case $u'v \leq x$ and hence $u'v \leq m$.

(3) We can find $w_1 \leq w$ and $v_1 \leq v$ so that $x = w_1 v_1$, so either $m = w_1 v_1$ or $sw_1 v_1$ and since $w_1, sw_1 \leq max\{w, sw\} \leq u$ we see that $m \in \{u'v' \mid u' \leq u, v' \leq v\}$. Take any $u' \leq u$, $v' \leq v$. If $su' < u'$, then $su' \leq w$, in which case $su'v' \leq x$ and hence $u'v' = ssu'v' \leq m$. On the other hand, if $u' < su'$, then $u' \leq w$ (by the lifting property), in which case $u'v' \leq x$ and hence $u'v' \leq m$. □

We denote the element of W in the preceeding lemma by $u \circ v$ just as Putcha does in [5]. $\circ$ turns out to be a very interesting and important binary operation. Of particular note, $uv = u \circ v$ if and only if $\ell(uv) = \ell(u) + \ell(v)$ for every $u, v \in W$.

Not only are both $\leq^+$ and $\leq^-$ partial orders on $\mathcal{R}$, but they can be seen to quite naturally extend some of the other, more familiar partial orders on important subsets of $\mathcal{R}$. Both $\leq^+$ and $\leq^-$ extend the Bruhat order on the group of units, W, as well as extend the usual product partial order for idempotents, $E(\mathcal{R})$.

Theorem 3.5. *For $\varepsilon = +$ or $-$,*

(1) $(\mathcal{R}, \leq^\varepsilon)$ is a partially ordered set

(2) $(W, \leq)$ is a sub-partially ordered set of $(\mathcal{R}, \leq^\varepsilon)$

(3) $(\Lambda, \leq)$ is a sub-partially ordered set of $(\mathcal{R}, \leq^\varepsilon)$

(4) $(E(\mathcal{R}), \leq)$ is a sub-partially ordered set of $(\mathcal{R}, \leq^\varepsilon)$

Proof. (1) The result for $\leq^+$ and $\leq^-$ are symmetrical, so we will just demonstate it for $\varepsilon = +$. We start with reflexivity. Since $e \leq e$ and $1 \in W_{\lambda^*(e)} W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ it is clear that $xey \leq^+ xey$. Suppose $xey \leq afb$ and $afb \leq xey$. Then $e \leq f \leq e$ which implies $e = f$. We can find $u, v \in W_{\lambda(e)}$ so that $x \leq au$, $a \leq xv$, $u^{-1}b \leq y$, and $v^{-1}y \leq b$. But since $y, b \in {}^{\lambda(e)}W$, $b \leq u^{-1}b \leq y$ and $y \leq v^{-1}y \leq b$. Thus $y = b$, and $u = v = 1$. From there we can see that $x \leq a \leq x$ or rather $x = a$. Hence $xey = afb$.

Now, towards transitivity, suppose that $xey \leq^+ afb$ and $afb \leq^+ cgd$. It is clear that $e \leq g$. We can find $u \in W_{\lambda^*(f)}$, $p \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ and $v \in W_{\lambda^*(g)}$, $q \in W_{\lambda_*(f)}$ so that $x \leq aup$, $a \leq cvq$, $p^{-1}u^{-1}b \leq y$, and $q^{-1}v^{-1}d \leq b$. By Theorem 1.4, we see that $x \leq aup$, $a \leq cvq$ imply $x \leq au$, $a \leq cv$.

Since $x \leq au$ the subword property tells us that $x = a_1u_1$ for some $a_1 \leq a$ and $u_1 \leq u$. Then we can see that $a_1 \leq a \leq cv$ and hence $x = a_1u_1 \leq (cv) \circ u_1 = (cv)u_2$ for some $u_2 \leq u_1 \leq u \in W_{\lambda^*(f)} \subseteq W_{\lambda^*(g)}$ (by Lemma 3.4). Then by Theorem 1.4, $q^{-1}u_2^{-1}v^{-1}d = u_2^{-1}q^{-1}v^{-1}d \leq u_2^{-1}b \leq u^{-1}b$. We know that $p^{-1}u^{-1}b \leq y$ so it follows that ${}^{\lambda_*(e)}(q^{-1}u_2^{-1}v^{-1}d) \leq p^{-1}u^{-1}b \leq y$. This means that we can find an element $r \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ such that ${}^{\lambda_*(e)}(q^{-1}u_2^{-1}v^{-1}d) = r^{-1}q^{-1}u_2^{-1}v^{-1}d$.

Notice that $qr \in W_{\lambda_*(f)} W_{\lambda_*(e)} \subseteq W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ and $vu_2 \in W_{\lambda^*(g)}$. By seeing $vu_2qr \in W_{\lambda^*(g)} W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ and $x \leq cvu_2qr$ and $r^{-1}q^{-1}u_2^{-1}v^{-1}d \leq y$ we may conclude $xey \leq^+ cgd$.

(2) For $\varepsilon = +$, notice that for any $u, v \in W$, $u \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ and $v \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ are the left standard forms. So we see that $u \leq^+ v$ if and only if we can find $w \in W_{\lambda^*(1)} W_{\lambda_*(1)} = W$ so that $u \leq vw$ and $w^{-1}1 \leq 1$. The latter condition forces $w = 1$ and so it is equivalent to $u \leq v$ in the usual Bruhat order. A similar proof can be given for $\leq^-$.

(3) Take $e, f \in \Lambda$. Observe that $1 \cdot e \cdot 1$, $1 \cdot f \cdot 1$ are the respective standard forms (regardless of ε). Then, depending on choice of ε, we see that $e \leq^\varepsilon f$ if and only if $e \leq f$ and there exists $w \in W_{\lambda^*(f)} W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ such that $1 \leq w$ and $w^{-1} \leq 1$ or $e \leq f$ and there exists $w \in W_{\lambda_*(e)} W_{\lambda^*(f)}$ such that $1 \leq w$ and $w^{-1} \leq 1$. In either case, $w = 1$ and we are left with $e \leq f$.

(4) We shall just prove the result for $\varepsilon = +$, as $\varepsilon = -$ is done in a similar manner. Let ueu^{-1}, vfv^{-1} be arbitrary idempotents, with $e, f \in \Lambda$. One can quickly check that it is safe to assume $u \in W^{\lambda(e)}$ and $v \in W^{\lambda(f)}$. Suppose that $ueu^{-1} \leq^+ vfv^{-1}$. Then $e \leq f$ and we can find $w \in W_{\lambda^*(f)}$ and $x \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ so that $vwx \leq u \leq vw$. Thus $u \in vwW_{\lambda_*(e)}$,

and we can find $y \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ so that $u = vwy$. We can rearrange and see that $u^{-1}v = y^{-1}w^{-1}$ and $v^{-1}u = wy$. Observe that $(ueu^{-1})(vfv^{-1}) = uey^{-1}w^{-1}fv^{-1} = uefw^{-1}v^{-1} = ueu^{-1}$ and $(vfv^{-1})(ueu^{-1}) = vfwyeu^{-1} = vwfeu^{-1} = ueu^{-1}$.

Suppose $(ueu^{-1})(vfv^{-1}) = ueu^{-1} = (vfv^{-1})(ueu^{-1})$. We write $v^{-1}u = pqr$ where $p \in W_{\lambda(f)}$, $q \in {}^{\lambda(f)}W^{\lambda(e)}$, and $r \in W_{\lambda(e)}$. Thus $ueu^{-1} = (vfv^{-1})(ueu^{-1}) = vpfqeru^{-1} = vp(f \wedge_q e)ru^{-1} \in W(f \wedge_q e)W$. Since $f \wedge_q e \in \Lambda$ it follows that $f \wedge_q e = e$, $q \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ and thus $f \wedge_q e = fqe = fe = e$. In a similar fashion we can show that $ef = e$. So we have demonstrated that $e \leq f$. In fact, we also know $ueu^{-1} = vfv^{-1}ueu^{-1} = vpfqeru^{-1} = vperu^{-1} = vpreu^{-1}$. It follows that $vpr \in uW_{\lambda_*(e)}$. This means we can find $z \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ so that $vprz = u$. By using the commuting properties of $W_{\lambda_*(f)} \subseteq W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ and $W_{\lambda^*(e)} \subseteq W_{\lambda^*(f)}$ we can rearrange this equation and find terms $a \in W_{\lambda^*(f)}$ and $b \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ so that $u = vprz = vab$. From there it follows that $u \leq v(ab)$ and $(ab)^{-1}v^{-1} \leq u^{-1}$ as desired. □

We are going to primarily be concerning ourselves with $\leq^+$, but nearly everything we discover will apply (with some symmetry) to $\leq^-$ and the right standard form. When possible, we will make joint statements using the above ε notation, however, if that would become too cumbersome, we will state the result in terms of one of the two (mostly $\leq^+$) and leave curious readers to mirror the arguments and come up with the analogous statement.

Proposition 3.6. *For any two elements, $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$, the following are equivalent.*

(1) $r \leq^+ s$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$

(2) $r^* \leq^- s^*$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$

Proof. Let $r = xey$ and $s = afb$ be written in left standard form. It is quick to see that $r^* = y^{-1}ex^{-1}$ and $s^* = b^{-1}fa^{-1}$ are written in right standard form. Then we note the following equivalences,

$$\begin{aligned}
r \leq^+ s \quad & \text{if and only if} \quad e \leq f \text{ and there exists } w \in W_{\lambda^*(f)}W_{\lambda_*(e)} \text{ so that } x \leq aw \text{ and } w^{-1}b \leq y \\
& \text{if and only if} \quad e \leq f \text{ and there exists } w \in W_{\lambda^*(f)}W_{\lambda_*(e)} \text{ so that } x^{-1} \leq w^{-1}a^{-1} \text{ and } b^{-1}w \leq y^{-1} \\
& \text{if and only if} \quad e \leq f \text{ and there exists } w \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}W_{\lambda^*(f)} \text{ so that } x^{-1} \leq wa^{-1} \text{ and } b^{-1}w^{-1} \leq y^{-1} \\
& \text{if and only if} \quad r^* \leq^- s^*
\end{aligned}$$

completing the result. □

An interesting result, which we will prove using hybrid standard form, is that when we restrict to an $\mathscr{H}$-class of $\mathcal{R}$, the partial orders $\leq^+$ and $\leq^-$ coincide. This is a decent generalization of Theorem 3.5 (2), as $W = H_1$.

Proposition 3.7. *For any two elements, $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$,*

(1) if $r \mathscr{L} s$ we can write their left standard forms as $r = aeb$ and $s = ceb$. Then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $a \leq c$.

(2) if $r \mathscr{R} s$ we can write their right standard forms as $r = aeb$ and $s = aec$. Then $r \leq^- s$ if and only if $b \leq c$.

(3) if $r \mathscr{H} s$ we can write their hybrid standard forms as $r = aebec$ and $s = aedec$. Then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $b \leq d$.

(4) if $r \mathscr{H} s$ we can write their hybrid standard forms as $r = aebec$ and $s = aedec$. Then $r \leq^- s$ if and only if $b \leq d$.

Proof. (1) $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if there exists $u \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}$ and $v \in W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ so that $a \leq cuv$ and $v^{-1}u^{-1}b \leq b$. But $v^{-1}u^{-1} \in W_{\lambda(e)}$. Since $b \in^{\lambda(e)} W$ it follows that $v^{-1}u^{-1}b \leq b$ if and only if $v^{-1}u^{-1} = 1$. So then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $a \leq c$ as desired.

(2) is similar.

(3) Let $r = aebec$ and $s = aedec$ be the hybrid standard form decompositions and observe the following equivalences.

$r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $e \leq e$ and there exists $w \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ so that $ab \leq adw$ and $w^{-1}c \leq c$
if and only if there exists $w \in W_{\lambda(e)}$ so that $ab \leq adw$ and $w^{-1}c \leq c$
if and only if $ab \leq ad$ *($w = 1$ since $c \leq w^{-1}c$ by Theorem 1.4 (9))*
if and only if $b \leq d$ *(by Theorem 1.4 (3) and (6))*

(4) is similar to (3). □

Interestingly, this shows that for any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ if $r \mathscr{J} e \in \Lambda$ then $(H_r, \leq^+) \cong (W_{\lambda^*(e)}, \leq) \cong (H_r, \leq^-)$.

Later on in the paper we shall introduce the idea of minimum elements (with respect to our Adherence orders) within a given equivalence class of a given Green's relation (either $\mathscr{J}$, $\mathscr{L}$, $\mathscr{R}$, $\mathscr{H}$). However, our discussion (Section 5) will take place within Renner-Coxeter monoids with a finite group of units. It turns out that some equivalences classes do have minimum elements even in the general setting. This is part of the content of our last result in this section.

Theorem 3.8. *Define the following three sets,*

$$\mathcal{GJ}^+ = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = xey \text{ in left standard form, } x = 1\} \quad \mathcal{JG}^- = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = yex \text{ in right standard form, } x = 1\}$$
$$\mathcal{O} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = aebec \text{ in hybrid standard form, } b = 1\}$$

Then,

(1) $\mathcal{GJ}^+ = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in L_r, r \leq^+ s\}$, $\mathcal{JG}^- = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in R_r, r \leq^- s\}$, $\mathcal{O} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in H_r, r \leq^+ s\}$, *and* $\mathcal{O} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in H_r, r \leq^- s\}$.

(2) $(\mathcal{GJ}^+)^* = \mathcal{JG}^-$ *and* $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}^*$.

(3) $\mathcal{GJ}^+$, $\mathcal{JG}^-$, *and* $\mathcal{O}$ *are monoids*

(4) $\mathcal{O}$ *is the smallest*

- *monoid containing both* $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ *and* $\mathcal{JG}^-$
- *inverse monoid containing* $\mathcal{GJ}^+$
- *inverse monoid containing* $\mathcal{JG}^-$

(5) $E(\mathcal{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{O}$

(6) Suppose $r \leq^+ s$. *Then* $a \leq^+ b$ *where* $a \in \mathcal{GJ}^+ \cap L_r$ *and* $b \in \mathcal{GJ}^+ \cap L_s$

(7) Suppose $r \leq^- s$. *Then* $a \leq^- b$ *where* $a \in \mathcal{JG}^- \cap R_r$ *and* $b \in \mathcal{JG}^- \cap R_s$

(8) $\mathcal{GJ}^+ \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{L}$ *and* $\mathcal{JG}^- \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{R}$

(9) $\mathcal{O} \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{H}$

Proof. (1) Due to the similarity between $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ and $\mathcal{JG}^+$, we shall just show $\mathcal{GJ}^+ = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in L_r, r \leq^+ s\}$. Suppose that $r \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ with standard form $1ey$ by definition. Consider $s \in L_r$. By Proposition 3.2 we can see that $s = xey$ for some $x \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$. Then we can see that $1 \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}W_{\lambda_*(e)}$ with $1 \leq x1$ and $1^{-1}y \leq y$, demonstrating that $r \leq^+ s$. So $\mathcal{GJ}^+ \subseteq \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in L_r, r \leq^+ s\}$.

Now suppose that $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and for all $s \in L_r$, $r \leq^+ s$. By again invoking Proposition 3.2 we can write $r = xey$ and notice that $ey \mathscr{L} r$ is also in left standard form. But, by the same reasoning as the last paragraph we quickly see that $ey \leq^+ r$. Since $r \leq^+ ey$ by definition of r we conclude that $r = ey \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$. Thus, $\mathcal{GJ}^+ \supseteq \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in L_r, r \leq^+ s\}$ completing the result.

By the preceeding proposition, it is clear that if we show $\mathcal{O} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in H_r, r \leq^+ s\}$ then $\mathcal{O} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall s \in H_r, r \leq^- s\}$. For $r = ae1ec \in \mathcal{O}$ and any $s = aebec \mathscr{H} r$ we see by Proposition 3.7 $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $1 \leq b$ which is always true. Conversely, if $r \leq^+ s$ for all elements in H_r then writing them in standard form we see $r = aebec$ and $aedec$ and $b \leq d$. However, $t = ae1ec \in \mathcal{O}$ is in left standard form and clearly $t \in H_r$. Thus $r \leq t$, but as we have noted, $t \leq r$ and hence $r = t$.

(2) Is clear, since $e^* = e$ for all idempotents, $w^* = w^{-1}$ for all $w \in W$ and $\left({}^I W\right)^{-1} = W^I$ for all $I \subseteq S$.

(3) By (2) is is clear that showing $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ is a monoid also shows that $\mathcal{JG}^-$ is a monoid. Suppose that $ex, fy \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ are written in left standard form. Consider $exfy$ and let $x = w \circ z$ with $w \in W^{\lambda(f)}$ (and by definition of x, $w \in^{\lambda(e)} W^{\lambda(f)}$) and $z \in W_{\lambda(f)}$. Then we find that $exfy = ewfzy = gzy$ where $g = e \wedge_w f$. We can see that $zy = z \circ y$ by their definitions.

Let $p =^{\lambda_*(g)} (zy)$. We claim that $p \in^{\lambda(g)} W$ and hence $exfy = gzy = gp \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$. Let us say $q = zyp^{-1} \in W_{\lambda_*(g)}$ and suppose that $sp < p$ for some $s \in \lambda^*(g)$. If no such s exists, then $p \in \lambda^*(g)W$ and we are already done.

We can find some t so that $p = st = s \circ t$. Then $zy = qp = qst = sqt$ since $q \in W_{\lambda_*(g)}$ and $\lambda^*(g)$ and $\lambda_*(g)$ commute. Then we see that $szy \leq zy$. Consider sz. There are two options, either $sz < z$, or $s > z$ (that is, $sz = s \circ z$).

In the first case we find $z = s\tau = s \circ \tau$ for some τ. It follows that $x = wz = ws\tau = sw\tau$ since $\lambda^*(g)$ commutes with $w \in W_{\lambda_{*)(g)}}$. This gives us a reduced word for x starting with $\lambda^*(g) \subseteq \lambda(e)$, a contradiction. In the second case, $z < sz \in W_{\lambda^*(g)}W_{\lambda(f)} \subseteq W_{\lambda(f)}$ implies that $zy < (sz)y = szy$, another contradiction.

Thus, $p \in^{\lambda^*(g)} W$ and since we started with $p \in^{\lambda_*(g)} W$ we conclude $p \in^{\lambda^*(g) \sqcup \lambda_*(g)} W =^{\lambda(g)} W$ as desired. Hence $exfy = gzy = gqp = gp \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$.

To show $\mathcal{O}$ is a monoid, let $pe1eq$ be an element of $\mathcal{O}$ written in hybrid standard form. Notice that $pe1eq = (pe)(eq)$ and indeed all elements of $\mathcal{O}$ are written as xy for some $x \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ and some $y \in \mathcal{JG}^-$. To complete this result, it suffices to show that for any $x \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ and $y \in \mathcal{JG}^-$ that $xy \in \mathcal{O}$ and $yx \in \mathcal{O}$.

Starting with xy, we can let $x = e\sigma$ and $y = \tau f$ for $e, f \in \Lambda$ and $\sigma \in^{\lambda(e)} W$, $\tau \in W^{\lambda(f)}$. Then $xy = e\sigma\tau f = \sigma(\sigma^{-1}e\sigma)(\tau f \tau^{-1})\tau = \sigma(\mu g \mu^{-1})\tau$ where $g \in \Lambda$ and $\mu \in W^{\lambda(g)}$. Since $\mu g \mu^{-1} = (\sigma^{-1}e\sigma)(\tau f \tau^{-1})$ it follows that $\mu g \mu^{-1} \leq^+ \sigma^{-1}e\sigma, \tau f \tau^{-1}$ and $\mu g \mu^{-1} \leq^- \sigma^{-1}e\sigma, \tau f \tau^{-1}$ as these are all idempotents.

$\mu g \mu^{-1} \leq^- \sigma^{-1}e\sigma$ implies that we can find $a \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}$ and $\alpha \in W_{\lambda_*(g)}$ so that $\alpha a \sigma = \mu^{-1}$, or rather $a\sigma = \alpha^{-1}\mu^{-1}$. Similarly, we can find $b \in W_{\lambda^*(f)}$ and $\beta \in W_{\lambda_*(g)}$ so that $\tau b \beta = \mu$ or $\tau b = \mu \beta^{-1}$. Thus, $xy = \sigma \mu g \mu^{-1} \tau = a^{-1}\alpha^{-1} g \beta^{-1} b^{-1} = a^{-1} g b^{-1}$.

Suppose that $a \notin {}^{\lambda^*(g)}W$, then we can find $s \in \lambda^*(g)$ and a $p \in W_{\lambda^*(e)}$ so that $a = sp = s \circ p$ (in effect giving us a reduced word for a starting with an element of $\lambda^*(g)$). But since $\sigma \in {}^{\lambda(e)}W$ and $\mu^{-1} \in {}^{\lambda(g)}W$ it is clear that $a \circ \sigma = a\sigma = \alpha^{-1}\mu^{-1} = \alpha^{-1} \circ \mu^{-1}$, giving us a reduced word for $\alpha^{-1}\mu^{-1}$ starting with a generator from $\lambda^*(g)$. However, $\alpha \in W_{\lambda_*(g)}$ and $\mu^{-1} \in {}^{\lambda(g)}W$ so it follows that $\alpha^{-1}\mu^{-1} \in {}^{\lambda^*(g)}W$ a contradiction. Thus $a^{-1} \in W^{\lambda^*(g)}$ and likewise $b^{-1} \in {}^{\lambda^*(g)}W$. It follows that $(a^{-1})^{\lambda(g)} = (a^{-1})^{\lambda_*(g)}$ and ${}^{\lambda(g)}(b^{-1}) = {}^{\lambda_*(g)}(b^{-1})$. So we conclude that $xy = a^{-1}gb^{-1} = (a^{-1})^{\lambda_*(g)}g1g^{\lambda_*(g)}()b^{-1})$ is in hybrid standard form and hence $xy \in \mathcal{O}$.

As for yx, we can keep our e, f, σ, and τ. Then $yx = \tau fe\sigma$. Let $g = fe = f \wedge_1 e \in \Lambda$. Then $g \leq e, f$ and so $\lambda_*(e), \lambda_*(f) \subseteq \lambda_*(g)$ and $\lambda^*(g) \subseteq \lambda^*(e), \lambda^*(f)$. So $\lambda(g) \subseteq \lambda(e) \cup \lambda_*(g), \lambda(f) \cup \lambda_*(g)$. Thus $\tau^{\lambda_*(g)} \in W^{\lambda(g)}$ and ${}^{\lambda_*(g)}\sigma \in {}^{\lambda(g)}W$. So then $yx = \tau^{\lambda_*(g)}g^{\lambda_*(g)}\sigma = \tau^{\lambda_*(g)}g1g^{\lambda_*(g)}\sigma$ is in hybrid standard form, and thus $yx \in \mathcal{O}$.

So now, for any two elements $r, s \in \mathcal{O}$ we can find $x_r, x_s \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ and $y_r, y_s \in \mathcal{JG}^-$ so that $r = x_r y_r$, $s = x_s y_s$. Then, $rs = x_r y_r x_s y_s = x_r x_t y_t y_s$ where $t = y_r x_s \in \mathcal{O}$ and $x_t \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$, $y_t \in \mathcal{JG}^-$ so that $t = x_t y_t$. Since $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ and $\mathcal{JG}^-$ are monoids we see that $rs = (x_r x_t)(y_t y_s)$ which is a product of something in $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ by something in $\mathcal{JG}^-$, and hence is an element of $\mathcal{O}$.

(4) Let M be a monoid containing $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ and $\mathcal{JG}^-$. Let $ae1ec = aec$ be an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{O}$. Then $ae1 \in \mathcal{JG}^-$ and $1ec \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ and so $ae1, 1ec \in M$. Since its a monoid we then see that $aec = ae1 \cdot 1ec \in M$. Thus $\mathcal{O} \subseteq M$. And by (3), $\mathcal{O}$ is a monoid, so this work shows it is the smallest.

Let M be an inverse monoid containing $\mathcal{GJ}^+$. Then by (2) we see that $\mathcal{JG}^- \subseteq M$ and so $\mathcal{O} \subseteq M$ by the above. Combining (2) and (3) we see that $\mathcal{O}$ is an inverse monoid, so it is indeed the smallest such monoid containing $\mathcal{GJ}^+$.

The final situation is similar to the latter.

(5) Take any idempotent, $e \in E(\mathcal{R})$. When written in hybrid standard form we have some $f \in \Lambda$ and $x \in W^{\lambda(f)}$ so that $e = xf1fx^{-1}$. So by definition, $e \in \mathcal{O}$.

(6) Let $r = xey$ and $s = pfq$ be written in left standard form. Then $a = 1ey$ and $b = 1fq$ are written in left standard form. Since $r \leq^+ s$ we can find $u \in W_{\lambda^*(f)}$ and $v \in W_{\lambda)*(e)}$ so that $x \leq puv$ and $v^{-1}u^{-1}q \leq y$. But it is clear that for any u, v we have $1 \leq 1uv$, so it follows directly that $a \leq^+ b$.

(7) is done simiarly to result (6).

(8) As they are similar, we will only show the $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ case. Suppose that there were two elements $r, s \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ with $r \mathscr{L} s$. Then by (1), $r \leq^+ s \leq^+ r$, so they are equal. Next, take any $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Write $r = xey$ in left standard form. It is clear that $r \mathscr{L} 1ey$ is also in left standard form and that $1ey \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$ by definition. Since for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $|L_r \cap \mathcal{GJ}^+| = 1$ we conclude $\mathcal{GJ}^+ \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{L}$.

(9) Suppose there are two elements $r, s \in \mathcal{O}$ with $r \mathscr{H} s$. Then by (1), $r \leq^+ s \leq^+ r$, so then $r = s$. Next, take any $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Write $r = aebec$ in hybrid standard form. It is clear that $r \mathscr{H} ae1ec$ is also in hybrid standard form and that $ae1ec \in \mathcal{O}$. Since for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $|H_r \cap \mathcal{GJ}^+| = 1$ we conclude $\mathcal{O} \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{H}$. □

These monoids of minimum elements are concepts that we will return to. The existence of minimum elements only for some of Green's relations and with a particular choice of $\leq^+$ or $\leq^-$ is due to the group of units, W.

Suppose each $\mathscr{J}$-class had a minimum element. Then for a given $e \in \Lambda$ the minimum element of $J_e = WeW$ must also be the minimum element of its $\mathscr{L}$-class and so has left standard form looking like ey.

$ey \leq ez$ if and only if there is some $x \in W_{\lambda(e)}$ so that $xz \leq y$. But we know that $z \leq xz$, so we conclude that $z \leq y$. For an infinite W this cannot be the case! With that in mind, we can explore the consequences of a finite group of units.

4 The Finite Case and Vanilla Form

The more familiar object of study is Renner monoids derived from reductive algebraic monoids. Such monoids have an advantage in that they are always finite. For the remainder of this paper, any $\mathcal{R}$ considered will be finite. With a finite Renner monoid comes a finite group of units, W, and it is well known that a finite Coxeter group has a maximum element in its Adherence order (Theorem 1.2). This element, w_0, will allow us to define a new cross-sectional lattice and with that better explore the Adherence order and its relationship with Green's relations.

Proposition 4.1. *Define the set of idempotents, $\Lambda^- := w_0\Lambda w_0$, called the* **opposite cross-sectional lattice**. *Then $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$ is a Renner-Coxeter system.*

Proof. Properties, (i) and (iii) are not altered by Λ^-.

(ii) Let $e \in E(\mathcal{R})$. Since Λ is a transversal we can find $u \in W$ and $f \in \Lambda$ so that $e = ufu^{-1}$. But then, $w_0fw_0 \in \Lambda^-$ by definition and it follows that $e = (uw_0)(w_0fw_0)(w_0u^{-1}) = (uw_0)(w_0fw_0)(uw_0)^{-1}$. Furthermore, if $e \mathscr{J} f$ for two $e, f \in \Lambda^-$ then we can find $w \in W$ so that $wew^{-1} = f$ and $g, h \in \Lambda$ so that $w_0ew_0 = g$ and $w_0fw_0 = h$. Combining these we see that $w_0ww_0gw_0w^{-1}w_0 = h$. But Λ is a transversal, so $g = h$ and hence $e = f$.

(iv) Suppose that $e \leq e' \in E(\mathcal{R})$. Then $ee' = e' = e'e$. Since $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$ is a Renner-Coxeter system we can find $f \leq f' \in \Lambda$ and $w \in W$ so that $wew^{-1} = f$ and $we'w^{-1} = f'$.

But then $(w_0w)e(w_0w)^{-1} = w_0wew^{-1}w_0 = w_0fw_0 = g \in \Lambda^-$ and $(w_0w)e'(w_0w)^{-1} = w_0we'w^{-1}w_0 = w_0f'w_0 = g' \in \Lambda^-$. We can also notice that $f \leq f'$ implies $ff' = f = f'f$ and so $gg' = w_0ff'w_0 = w_0fw_0w_0f'w_0 = w_0fw_0 = g = w_0fw_0 = w_0f'fw_0 = w_0f'w_0w_0fw_0 = g'g$. So $g \leq g' \in \Lambda^-$ and $(w_0w) \in W$ satisfy this requirement.

(v) Let $e \in \Lambda^-$ and $f = w_0ew_0 \in \Lambda$. Notice that because $\ell(w_0ww_0) = \ell(w)$ and hence, $w_0Sw_0 = S$ we have the series of equalities, $\lambda^*(e) = \{s \in S \mid se = es \neq e\} = \{s \in S \mid w_0sw_0w_0ew_0 = w_0ew_0w_0sw_0 \neq w_0ew_0\} = w_0\{s \in S \mid s(w_0ew_0) = (w_0ew_0)s \neq w_0ew_0\}w_0 = w_0\lambda^*(w_0ew_0)w_0 \subseteq S$. So the map $\lambda^* : \Lambda^- \to P(S)$ is certainly defined.

Pick any $e \leq e' \in \Lambda$ and let $f = w_0ew_0 \in \Lambda$, $f' = w_0e'w_0 \in \Lambda$. As we noted in (iv) $e \leq e'$ implies that $f \leq f'$. So then $\lambda^*(e) = w_0\lambda^*(f)w_0 \subseteq w_0\lambda^*(f')w_0 = \lambda^*(e')$ as desired.

(vi) Notice, as we similarly saw in (v), that, using the fact of $w_0Sw_0 = S$, for any $e \in \Lambda^-$, we have the chain $\{w \in W \mid we = ew\} = w_0\{w \in W \mid w_0ww_0w_0ew_0 = w_0ew_0w_0ww_0\}w_0 = w_0W_{\lambda(w_0ew_0)}w_0 = W_{w_0\lambda(w_0ew_0)w_0}$ and $\{w \in W \mid we = ew = e\} = w_0\{w \in W \mid w_0ww_0w_0ew_0 = w_0ew_0w_0ww_0 = w_0ew_0\}w_0 = w_0W_{\lambda(w_0ew_0)}w_0 = W_{w_0\lambda_*(w_0ew_0)w_0}$. So both are clearly standard parabolic subgroups of W. □

This means that we know have four different standard forms for a given element of $\mathcal{R}$ and four different partial

orders. Our next result relates partial orders in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$ and $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$.

Proposition 4.2. *For any two elements, $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$, the following are equivalent.*

(1) $r \leq^+ s$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$

(2) $w_0 r w_0 \leq^+ w_0 s w_0$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$

Proof. Let $r = xey$ and $s = afb$ be written in left standard form. We claim $w_0 r w_0 = (w_0 x w_0)(w_0 e w_0)(w_0 y w_0)$ and $w_0 r w_0 = (w_0 a w_0)(w_0 f w_0)(w_0 b w_0)$ are in left standard form in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$. Suppose $(w_0 x w_0) \notin W^{\lambda_*(w_0 e w_0)}$, then we can find a reduced word expression $(w_0 x w_0) = s_1 \cdots s_k$ with $s_k \in \lambda_*(w_0 e w_0)$. However, for any $s \in S$, $\ell(w_0 s w_0) = \ell(s) = 1$, so $w_0 s w_0$ is a generator and it follows that $(w_0 s_1 w_0) \cdots (w_0 s_k w_0)$ is a reduced word for x ending in $(w_0 s_k w_0) \in w_0 \lambda_*(w_0 e w_0) w_0 = \lambda_*(e)$, a contradiction. Similar arguments for $(w_0 y w_0)$, $(w_0 a w_0)$, and $(w_0 b w_0)$ establish our claim.

Then we note the following equivalences,

$$\begin{aligned}
r \leq^+ s \quad & \text{if and only if} \quad e \leq f \text{ and there exists } w \in W_{\lambda^*(f)} W_{\lambda_*(e)} \text{ so that } x \leq aw \text{ and } w^{-1} b \leq y \\
& \text{if and only if} \quad w_0 e w_0 \leq w_0 f w_0 \text{ and there exists } w \in w_0 W_{\lambda^*(w_0 f w_0)} w_0 w_0 W_{\lambda_*(w_0 e w_0)} w_0 \text{ so} \\
& \qquad\qquad \text{that } w_0 x w_0 \leq w_0 a w_0 w_0 w w_0 \text{ and } w_0 w^{-1} w_0 w_0 b w_0 \leq w_0 y w_0 \\
& \text{if and only if} \quad w_0 e w_0 \leq w_0 f w_0 \text{ and there exists } w \in W_{\lambda^*(w_0 f w_0)} W_{\lambda_*(w_0 e w_0)} \text{ so} \\
& \qquad\qquad \text{that } w_0 x w_0 \leq w_0 a w_0 w \text{ and } w^{-1} w_0 b w_0 \leq w_0 y w_0 \\
& \text{if and only if} \quad w_0 r w_0 \leq^+ w_0 s w_0
\end{aligned}$$

completing the result. □

Theorem 4.3. *Let $r \in \mathcal{R}$. There exists a unique set of elements, $\sigma_-, e_-, \sigma_0, e_+, \sigma_+ \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfying the following four properties:*

(i) $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$

(ii) $e_+ \in \Lambda$, $e_- \in \Lambda^-$, and $e_- \mathrel{\mathscr{J}} r \mathrel{\mathscr{J}} e_+$

(iii) $\sigma_+ \in {}^{\lambda(e_+)}W$ and $\sigma_- \in W^{\lambda(e_-)}$

(iv) $\sigma_0 \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)} \left({}^{\lambda_*(e_-)} w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)} \right) W_{\lambda^*(e_+)} = {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)} \left(W_{\lambda(e_-)} w_0 W_{\lambda(e_+)} \right)^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$

When we write the element $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ in this way we say that r is written in **vanilla form**.

Proof. Let $r = xey$ be in left standard form with respect to $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$. Notice that $f = w_0 e w_0 \in \Lambda^-$ and so $r = xey = xeey = x w_0 f w_0 ey$. Let $z = (x w_0)^{\lambda(f)}$ then we can find $u \in W_{\lambda(f)}$ so that $zu = x w_0$ and by substituting in we get, $r = zuf w_0 ey = zf u w_0 ey$. Now, $u w_0 \in W_{\lambda(f)} w_0 = W_{\lambda(f)} W_{\lambda(f)} w_0 = W_{\lambda(f)} w_0 W_{\lambda(e)} w_0 w_0 = W_{\lambda(f)} w_0 W_{\lambda(e)}$. By taking $v = {}^{\lambda_*(f)}(u w_0)^{\lambda_*(e)}$ we see that $r = zfvey$ satisfies the conditions of our vanilla form, establishing existence.

Toward uniqueness, suppose that $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+ = \tau_- f_- \tau_0 f_+ \tau_+$ and both decompositions satisfy the vanilla form conditions. Then $e_- \mathrel{\mathscr{J}} f_-$ and $e_+ \mathrel{\mathscr{J}} f_+$, and since Λ^- and Λ are transversals it is immediate that $e_- = f_-$ and $e_+ = f_+$.

Since $\sigma_0, \tau_0 \in {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)} \left(W_{\lambda(e_-)} w_0 W_{\lambda(e_+)} \right)^{\lambda_*(e_+)} \subseteq W_{\lambda(e_-)} w_0 W_{\lambda(e_+)}$ we can quickly see that $e_- \sigma_0 = e_- \sigma_0 e_+ = \sigma_0 e_+$ and $e_- \tau_0 = e_- \tau_0 e_+ = \tau_0 e_+$. Then $(\sigma_- \sigma_0)^{\lambda_*(e_+)} e_+ \sigma_+ = (\sigma_- \sigma_0) e_+ \sigma_+ = r = (\tau_- \tau_0) e_+ \tau_+ = (\tau_- \tau_0)^{\lambda_*(e_+)} e_+ \tau_+$ and the ends are in left standard form. By uniqueness of left standard form then $\sigma_+ = \tau_+$. Similarly, $\sigma_- = \tau_-$.

So then $\sigma_-^{-1} r \sigma_+^{-1} = e_-\sigma_0 e_+ = e_-\tau_0 e_+$, or rather $e_-\sigma_0 = e_-\tau_0$. Rearranging we find that $e_-\sigma_0\tau_0^{-1} = e_-$ and hence $\sigma_0\tau_0^{-1} \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)}$. So then $\sigma_0 \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)}\tau_0 \subseteq W_{\lambda_*(e_-)}\tau_0 W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$. But since $\sigma_0, \tau_0 \in^{\lambda_*(e_-)} W^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ we conclude that $\sigma_0 = \tau_0$. □

Vanilla form (named to avoid overused terms like normal and canonical) can be interestingly contrasted with hybrid standard form. Both bridge the gap between left and right standard forms. Both (as we will see in a bit) allow us to identify each of Green's relations by observing the decomposition. However, the hybrid standard form is contained solely in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$, whereas our new vanilla form allows us to study both $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$ and $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$.

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ is in vanilla form. Then,*

(1) $\sigma_+^{-1} \leq_L \sigma_0$ and $\sigma_-^{-1} \leq_R \sigma_0$

(2) $r = (\sigma_-\sigma_0)e_+\sigma_+$ is in left standard form (in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$)

(3) $r = \sigma_- e_- (\sigma_0\sigma_+)$ is in right standard form (in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$)

Proof. (1) We shall just show $\sigma_+^{-1} \leq_L \sigma_0$ as $\sigma_-^{-1} \leq_R \sigma_0$ is done symmetrically. $\sigma_+ \in^{\lambda(e_+)} W$, so $\sigma_+^{-1} \in W^{\lambda(e_+)}$. $\sigma_+^{-1} w_0(\lambda(e_+)) = \sigma_+^{-1} \circ w_0(\lambda(e_+)) \leq_L w_0$ (as $w \leq_L w_0$ for all $w \in W$). This means we can find $u \in W$ so that $u\sigma_+^{-1} w_0(\lambda(e_+)) = w_0$ with $\ell(u) + \ell(\sigma_+^{-1} w_0(\lambda(e_+))) = \ell(w_0)$. But then, since $\ell(\sigma_+^{-1} w_0(\lambda(e_+))) = \ell(\sigma_+^{-1}) + \ell(w_0(\lambda(e_+)))$ and $w_0 = w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} \circ w_0(\lambda(e_+)) = w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} w_0(\lambda(e_+))$ it follows that $w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} = u\sigma_+^{-1}$ and $\ell(w_0^{\lambda(e_+)}) = \ell(u) + \ell(\sigma_+^{-1})$. Thus $\sigma_+^{-1} \leq_L w_0^{\lambda(e_+)}$.

We know that $\sigma_0 \in W_{\lambda(e_-)} w_0 W_{\lambda(e_+)} = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}W_{\lambda(e_-)} w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} W_{\lambda(e_+)} = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}W_{\lambda(e_-)} w_0^{\lambda(e_+)}$. Now, since ${}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} = w_0^{\lambda(e_+)}$ it follows that we can find $v \in W_{\lambda(e_-)}$ so that $\sigma_0 = v w_0^{\lambda(e_+)}$ and $\ell(\sigma_0) = \ell(v) + \ell(w_0^{\lambda(e_+)})$. So $w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} \leq_L \sigma_0$ and since $\leq_L$ is transitive, $\sigma_+^{-1} \leq_L w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} \leq_L \sigma_0$ implies $\sigma_+^{-1} \leq_L \sigma_0$.

(2) and (3) both follow from (1). Since $\sigma_-^{-1} \leq_R \sigma_0$ we see that $\sigma_0 = \sigma_-^{-1} w = \sigma_-^{-1} \circ w$ for some $w \in W$. Thus, $r = \sigma_-\sigma_0 e_+\sigma_+ = we\sigma_+$, so we only need show that $w \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$. Suppose not, then there exists a reduced word for w which ends in an element of $\lambda_*(e)$. However, then $\sigma_-^{-1} w$ gives a reduced word expression for σ_0 ending in the same element of $\lambda_*(e)$, a contradiction. This demonstrates (2) and (3) is similar. □

Corollary 4.5. *Suppose $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ and $r = \tau_- f_- \tau_0 f_+ \tau_+$ are in vanilla form. Then,*

(1) $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $e_- = f_-$ if and only if $e_+ = f_+$

(2) $r \mathscr{L} s$ if and only if $e_- = f_-$, $e_+ = f_+$, and $\sigma_+ = \tau_+$

(3) $r \mathscr{R} s$ if and only if $\sigma_- = \tau_-$, $e_- = f_-$, and $e_+ = f_+$

(4) $r \mathscr{H} s$ if and only if $\sigma_- = \tau_-$, $e_- = f_-$, $e_+ = f_+$, and $\sigma_+ = \tau_+$

Proof. (1) We know we can write $r = (\sigma_-\sigma_0)e_+\sigma_+$ and $s = (\tau_-\tau_0) f_+\tau_+$ in left standard form. By Proposition 3.2 we know $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $e_+ = f_+$. Similarly, we can show $r \mathscr{J} s$ if and only if $e_- = f_-$ using right standard form.

(2) We can write $r = (\sigma_-\sigma_0)e_+\sigma_+$ and $s = (\tau_-\tau_0) f_+\tau_+$ in left standard form. By Proposition 3.2 we know $r \mathscr{L} s$ if and only if $e_+ = f_+$ and $\sigma_+ = \tau_+$.

(3) is done similar to (2).

(4) is a combination of (2) and (3). □

The most important result of vanilla form is the following, allowing us to show an equivalence between Adherence orders on $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$ and $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$.

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ and $r = \tau_- f_- \tau_0 f_+ \tau_+$ are in vanilla form. Then the following are equivalent,*

(1) $e_- \leq f_-$, $e_+ \leq f_+$, and there exist $w_- \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)} W_{\lambda^*(f_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(f_+)} W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ so that $\tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq w_- \tau_0 w_+$, and $w_+^{-1} \tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$

(2) $r \leq^+ s$ as elements of $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$

(3) $r \leq^- s$ as elements of $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$

Proof. (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) Suppose we have $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(f_+)} W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ such that $\sigma_- \sigma_0 \leq \tau_- \tau_0 w_+$, and $w_+^{-1} \tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. We can see that $\tau_0 w_+ \in W_{\lambda(f_-)} w_0 W_{\lambda(f_+)} = W_{\lambda(f_-)} w_0$, so there exists $y \in W_{\lambda(f_-)}$ such that $\tau_0 w_+ = y w_0$. Likewise there exists $x \in W_{\lambda(e_-)}$ so that $\sigma_0 = x w_0$. Thus, $\sigma_- x w_0 = \sigma_- \sigma_0 \leq \tau_- \tau_0 w_+ = \tau_- y w_0$ which is equivalent to $\tau_- y \leq \sigma_- x$.

Since $\sigma_- \in W^{\lambda(e_-)}$ and $x \in W_{\lambda(e_-)}$, by Theorem 1.4 we can find $a, b, c \in W$ so that $a = (\tau_- y)^{\lambda(e_-)}$, $b, c \in W_{\lambda(e_-)}$ with $abc = a \circ b \circ c$, $ab \leq \sigma_-$ and $c \leq x$. Let $w_- = c y^{-1} \in W_{\lambda(e_-)} W_{\lambda(f_-)} = W_{\lambda_*(e_-)} W_{\lambda^*(f_-)}$. Then we see that $\tau_- w_-^{-1} = \tau_- y c^{-1} = abcc^{-1} = ab \leq \sigma_-$ and $w_- y = c \leq x \Leftrightarrow \sigma_0 = x w_0 \leq w_- y w_0 = w_- \tau_0 w_+$.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) Suppose we have $w_- \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)} W_{\lambda^*(f_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(f_+)} W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ such that $\tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq w_- \tau_0 w_+$, and $w_+^{-1} \tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. By Theorem 1.5, since $\sigma_-^{-1} \leq_R \sigma_0$, we can conclude that $\sigma_- \sigma_0 \leq \tau_- w_-^{-1} w_- \tau_0 w_+ = \tau_- \tau_0 w_+$ which satisfies the conditions of $r \leq^+ s$.

(3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1) follows by nearly identical reasoning to our previous two arguments, finishing off this result. □

The following corollary gives us a set of broader results than those in Proposition 3.7.

Corollary 4.7. *Take two elements $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$ and let their vanilla forms be $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ and $s = \tau_- f_- \tau_0 f_+ \tau_+$.*

(1) If $r \mathscr{J} s$ then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if there exist elements $w_- \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$ so that $\tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq w_- \tau_0 w_+$, and $w_+^{-1} \tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$

(2) If $r \mathscr{L} s$ then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $\sigma_- \sigma_0 \leq \tau_- \tau_0$

(3) If $r \mathscr{R} s$ then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $\sigma_0 \sigma_+ \leq \tau_0 \tau_+$

(4) If $r \mathscr{H} s$ then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $\sigma_0 \leq \tau_0$

Proof. (1) Since $r \mathscr{J} s$ Corollary 4.5 tells us that $e_- = f_-$ and $e_+ = f_+$, and so our condition for $r \leq^+ s$ reduces to $w_- \in W_{\lambda(e_-)}$, $w_+ \in W_{\lambda(e_+)}$ so that $\tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq w_- \tau_0 w_+$, $w_+^{-1} \tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. Let $u_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$, $v_+ \in W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$, $u_- \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}$, $v_- \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)}$ so that $w_+ = u_+ v_+ = u_+ \circ v_+$ and $w_- = v_- u_- = v_- \circ u_-$. We can quickly see that $\tau_- u_-^{-1} \leq \tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq u_- \tau_0 u_+$, and $u_+^{-1} \tau_+ \leq w_+^{-1} \tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$.

The reverse implication is obvious.

(2) Since $r \mathscr{L} s$ then $e_+ = f_+$ and $\sigma_+ = \tau_+$. By Corollary 4.4 we know that $r = (\sigma_- \sigma_0) e_+ \sigma_+$ and $s = (\tau_- \tau_0) e_+ \sigma_+$ are in left standard form. Then $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if we can find $w_+ \leq W_{\lambda^*(e_+)} W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ so that $(\sigma_- \sigma_0) \leq (\tau_- \tau_0) w_+$

and $w_+^{-1}\sigma_+ \leq \sigma_+$. Now, since $w_+ \in W_{\lambda(e_+)}$ we see that $\sigma_+ \leq w_+^{-1}\sigma_+ = \sigma_+$ forcing $w_+ = 1$. Thus, $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $\sigma_-\sigma_0 \leq \tau_-\tau_0$.

(3) is similar to (2).

(4) Since $r\mathscr{H}s$ we know by Corollary 4.5 that $\sigma_- = \tau_-$, $e_- = f_-$, $e_+ = f_+$, and $\sigma_+ = \tau_+$. $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if there exists $w_- \in W_{\lambda(e_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda(e_+)}$ so that $\sigma_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq w_-\tau_0 w_+$, and $w_+^{-1}\sigma_+ \leq \sigma_+$. Like (2) it is quick to show $w_- = w_+ = 1$, reducing our condition to $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $\sigma_0 \leq \tau_0$. □

Of course, one could construct a nearly identical decomposition to the vanilla form which allows for the quick comparisons of Green's relations but instead allows the computation of $\leq^-$ and extends right standard form. This, "**chocolate**" form while an interesting concept perhaps, would be functionally no different from vanilla form (indeed one can derive this new form by taking the inverse of the vanilla form for r^*, or simply studying vanilla form in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$), and so we will confine our results to focussing on the vanilla form. This will mean placing emphasis on $\leq^+$ over $\leq^-$, but interested readers can easily mimic the proofs and derive the corresponding results.

Corollary 4.8. *The following are equivalent for any $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$*

(1) $r \leq^+ s$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$

(2) $r^* \leq^- s^*$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$

(3) $w_0 r w_0 \leq^+ w_0 s w_0$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$

(4) $r \leq^- s$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$

(5) $r^* \leq^+ s^*$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$

(6) $w_0 r w_0 \leq^- w_0 s w_0$ in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$

This corollary merely sums up the various Adherence order equivalences we have come across.

Proof. (1) ⇔ (2) and (4) ⇔ (5) follow from Proposition 3.6. (1) ⇔ (3) and (4) ⇔ (6) follow from Proposition 4.2. And lastly, (1) ⇔ (4) by Theorem 4.6. □

We will close out this section with a very interesting result about the $\mathscr{J}$ relation and the Adherence order. Recalling that $r\mathscr{J}s$ if and only if there exists t so that $r\mathscr{R}t\mathscr{L}s$ if and only if there exists u so that $r\mathscr{L}u\mathscr{R}s$, the following proposition tells us that these t and u may be chosen with the Adherence order in mind.

Proposition 4.9. *For any two elements, $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$ with $r\mathscr{J}s$ and $r \leq^+ s$, there exist elements, $t, u \in \mathcal{R}$ so that $r \leq^+ t \leq^+ s$, $r \leq^+ u \leq^+ s$ and $r\mathscr{R}t\mathscr{L}s$ and $r\mathscr{L}u\mathscr{R}s$.*

Proof. Let $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ and $s = \tau_- e_- \tau_0 e_+ \tau_+$ be in vanilla form. By Corollary 4.7 since $r \leq^+ s$ there exist $w_- \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$ such that $\tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq w_-\tau_0 w_+$, and $w_+^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. Let $t = \sigma_- e_-(w_-\tau_0)e_+\tau_+$ and $u = \tau_- e_-(\tau_0 w_+)e_+\sigma_+$. It is clear from the definition of vanilla form that $\tau_0 \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}\left(^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)}\right)W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$ and so $(w_-\tau_0), (\tau_0 w_+) \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}\left(^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)}\right)W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$, hence t and u are in vanilla form.

Since they are all in vanilla form, Corollary 4.5 allows us to easily conclude that $r\mathscr{R}t\mathscr{L}s$ and $r\mathscr{L}u\mathscr{R}s$. Observe that $1 \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$ satisfy $\sigma_- 1^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $\sigma_0 \leq 1(w_-\tau_0)w_+$, and $w_+^{-1}\sigma_+ \leq \tau_+$. So $r \leq^+ t$. $w_-^{-1} \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}$

and $1 \in W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$ satisfy $\tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$, $(w_-\tau_0) \leq w_-\tau_0 1$, and $1^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \tau_+$. So $t \leq^+ s$. Likewise we can show $r \leq^+ u \leq^+ s$, completing the proof. □

5 Maximum and Minimum Elements

In Section 5 of [4] an interesting element of a given $\mathscr{H}$-class in a Renner monoid is distinguished. For This particular example motivates the following definition and this section's discussion.

Definition 5.1. *For an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathscr{T}$, $\varepsilon = +$ or $-$, and any element $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we define,*

$$max^{\varepsilon}T_r = \begin{cases} s \in T_r & \text{if } \forall t \in T_r, t \leq^{\varepsilon} s \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad min^{\varepsilon}T_r = \begin{cases} s \in T_r & \text{if } \forall t \in T_r, s \leq^{\varepsilon} t \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The left element, if it exists, is called the **absolute maximum element** *of the $\mathscr{T}$-class of r. The right element, if it exists, is called the* **absolute minimum element** *of the $\mathscr{T}$-class.*

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose there are two equivalence relations, $\mathscr{T}$ and $\mathscr{U}$ so that $r\mathscr{T}s$ implies $r\mathscr{U}s$ for all $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$. Then for any $r \in \mathcal{R}$, assuming they exist, $max^{\varepsilon}T_r \leq^{\varepsilon} max^{\varepsilon}U_r$ and $min^{\varepsilon}U_r \leq^{\varepsilon} min^{\varepsilon}T_r$.*

Proof. Suppose that $t = max^{\varepsilon}T_r$ and $u = max^{\varepsilon}U_r$. Then it is clear that $t\mathscr{T}r\mathscr{U}u$ implies that $t\mathscr{U}u$. But by definition $s \leq^{\varepsilon} u$ for all $s\mathscr{U}u$. Then $t \leq^{\varepsilon} u$ as desired. The minimum case is done similarly. □

As it turns out, for the Green's relations, $\mathscr{H}$, $\mathscr{L}$, $\mathscr{R}$, and $\mathscr{J}$ (in a finite $\mathcal{R}$) these maximum and minimum elements always exist and can be characterized using the vanilla form decomposition.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ be written in vanilla form in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^{\varepsilon}, S)$.*

(1) $r = min^{\epsilon}H_r$ if and only if $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}$

(2) $r = min^{\epsilon}L_r$ if and only if $\sigma_- = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}$, $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}$

(3) $r = min^{\epsilon}R_r$ if and only if $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}$, $\sigma_+ = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}$

(4) $r = min^{\epsilon}J_r$ if and only if $\sigma_- = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}$, $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}$, $\sigma_+ = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}$

(5) $r = max^{\epsilon}H_r$ if and only if $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$

(6) $r = max^{\epsilon}L_r$ if and only if $\sigma_- = 1$, $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$

(7) $r = max^{\epsilon}R_r$ if and only if $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$, $\sigma_+ = 1$

(8) $r = max^{\epsilon}J_r$ if and only if $\sigma_- = 1$, $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$, $\sigma_+ = 1$

Proof. The proofs are similar, so we will just look at $\varepsilon = +$.

(1) and (5) By definition of vanilla form we know $\sigma_0 \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}\left({}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)}\right)W_{\lambda^*(e_+)} \subseteq W_{\lambda(e_-)}w_0W_{\lambda(e_+)}$. Then we can see ${}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)} \leq \sigma_0 \leq w_0$ and then, ${}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)} \leq \sigma_0 \leq {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$. By Corollary 4.7 we can then conclude that $\sigma_- e_-{}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}e_+\sigma_+ \leq^+ \sigma_- e_-\sigma_0 e_+\sigma_+ \leq^+ \sigma_- e_-{}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}e_+\sigma_+$, each of which is written in vanilla form, and (by Corollary 4.5) belong to the same $\mathscr{H}$-class. As r was arbitrary, we are done.

(2) and (6) Notice that for any σ_- and σ_0 satisfying the conditions of vanilla form, $\sigma_-\sigma_0 \in W^{\lambda_*(e_+)} \subseteq W$. We can see that $1 \leq \sigma_-\sigma_0 \leq w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)} = {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$. It follows that $1e_+\sigma_+ \leq^+ (\sigma_-\sigma_+)e_+\sigma_+ \leq^{+\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}e_+\sigma_+$

If $r = min^+L_r$ then it is not hard to see $r = min^+H_r$. So by (1) we see that $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}$, and hence $\sigma_- = \sigma_+^{-1} = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}$. Thus, $r = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}e_-{}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}e_+\sigma_+$. If $r = max^+L_r$ then it is not hard to see $r = max^+H_r$. So by (5) we see that $\sigma_0 = {}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$, and hence $\sigma_- = 1$. So $r = 1e_-{}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}e_+\sigma_+$.

${}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)} = w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ This demonstrates (6).

(3) and (7) are done similarly to (2) and (6).

(4) and (8) If $r = min^+J_r$ then it is clear that $r = min^+L_r = min^+R_r = min^+H_r$ and by combining our previous results, $r = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}e_-{}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_+)}e_+{}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0{}^{\lambda(e_-)}$. If $r = max^+J_r$ then it is clear that $r = max^+L_r = max^+R_r = max^+H_r$ and by combining our previous results, $r = 1e_-{}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0{}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}e_+1$. □

In fact, we have already seen (and even without the finiteness assumption!) that min^+L_r and min^-R_r always exist. Indeed, the collection of such elements are $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ and $\mathcal{JG}^-$ respectively, from Theorem 3.8. The elements introduced in Section 5 of [4] are actually the minimum elements of $\mathscr{H}$-classes and hence form the familiar object, $\mathcal{O}$.

Corollary 5.4. *Let $\varepsilon = +$ or $-$. Define the following subsets of our monoid, $\mathcal{R}$: $\mathcal{GJ}^\varepsilon = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = min^\varepsilon L_r\}$, $\mathcal{JG}^\varepsilon = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = min^\varepsilon R_r\}$, $\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = min^\varepsilon J_r\}$, and $\mathcal{O}^\varepsilon = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = min^\varepsilon H_r\}$.*

(1) $\mathcal{O}^+ = \mathcal{O}^-$ and we will henceforth refer to it as $\mathcal{O}$

(2) $\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon = \mathcal{GJ}^\varepsilon \cap \mathcal{JG}^\varepsilon$

(3) each of these sets are monoids

(4) $\mathcal{GJ}^+ = (\mathcal{JG}^-)^*$ and $\mathcal{JG}^+ = (\mathcal{GJ}^-)^*$

(5) $\mathcal{O}$ is the smallest monoid containing $\mathcal{GJ}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{JG}^\varepsilon$

(6) $\mathcal{O}$ is the smallest inverse monoid containing $\mathcal{GJ}^\varepsilon$

(7) $\mathcal{O}$ is the smallest inverse monoid containing $\mathcal{JG}^\varepsilon$

(8) $w_0\mathcal{GJ}^\varepsilon = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^\varepsilon L_r\}$

(9) $\mathcal{JG}^\varepsilon w_0 = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^\varepsilon R_r\}$

(10) $w_0\Lambda = \Lambda^- w_0 = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^+ J_r\}$ and $w_0\Lambda^- = \Lambda w_0 = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^- J_r\}$

(11) $w_0\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}w_0 = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^\varepsilon H_r\}$ for each ε

(12) $\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{J}$, $\mathcal{GJ}^\varepsilon \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{L}$, $\mathcal{JG}^\varepsilon \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{R}$, $\mathcal{O} \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{H}$

Proof. (1) This has already been covered by Theorem 3.8, but is included for completeness.

(2) This is an application of Theorem 5.3 (2), (3), and (4). Just comparing the vanilla forms in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$ gives the $\varepsilon = +$ case and a symmetry argument takes care of the $\varepsilon = -$ case.

(3) Each of $\mathcal{O}$, $\mathcal{GJ}^+$, and $\mathcal{JG}^-$ are monoids by Theorem 3.8. The monoidness of $\mathcal{JG}^+$ and $\mathcal{GJ}^-$ are simiarly demonstrated, but as part of the Renner-Coxeter system, $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$. By (2), $\mathcal{N}^+$ and $\mathcal{N}^-$ are intersections of monoids, and hence monoids themselves.

(4) The first result is Theorem 3.8 (2) and the second follows in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$.

(5) By Theorem 3.8 we know $\mathcal{O}$ is the smallest monoid containing $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ and $\mathcal{JG}^-$. By similar reasoning, but in the setting of the $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$ system we can conclude that $\mathcal{O}$ is also the smallest monoid containing $\mathcal{GJ}^-$ and

$\mathcal{JG}^+$. Combining these results gives us (5).

(6) For $\varepsilon = +$ this has been done in Theorem 3.8 (4), and the case for $-$ follows by similar reasoning, but in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$.

(7) For $\varepsilon = -$ this has been done in Theorem 3.8 (4), and the case for $+$ follows by similar reasoning, but in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$.

(8) Consider $r = w_0 ey$ for any $ey \in \mathcal{GJ}^+$. Then $r = w_0^{\lambda_*(e)} ey$ is written in left standard form. For any $s \mathscr{L} r$, we can write $s = xey$ for $x \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$. But, $x \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$ implies (by Theorem 1.5) that $x \leq_L w_0^{\lambda_*(e)}$ and so $x \leq w_0^{\lambda_*(e)}$. But this implies that $xey \leq^+ w_0^{\lambda_*(e)} ey$ and so $s \leq^+ r$. Since s was arbitrary, we see $r = max^+ L_r$, and since every $\mathscr{L}$-class in $\mathcal{R}$ has exactly one element of $\mathcal{GJ}^+$ in it (by definition) then every $\mathscr{L}$-class has such a maximum element, concluding our result.

The $\varepsilon = -$ case is handled analogously.

(9) is taken care of in a manner similar to (8).

(10) For any $\mathscr{J}$-class, we see that there is exactly one element of the form $w_0 \Lambda$, so it suffices to show that this element is largest in the given $\mathscr{J}$-class. Let $w_0 e = w_0^{\lambda_*(e)} e$ be such an element written in left standard form. Consider an arbitrary element xey written in left standard form from the same $\mathscr{J}$-class. Then $x \in W^{\lambda_*(e)}$ implies that $x \leq w_0^{\lambda_*(e)}$. Adding to this the fact that $1 \leq y$, we conclude that $xey \leq^+ w_0 e$. So $w_0 \Lambda = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^+ J_r\}$. Simiarly we can show that $\Lambda^- w_0 = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^+ J_r\}$.

The $\varepsilon = -$ case is completed by performing the same actions, but in $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^-, S)$, allowing us to conclude that (with regards to $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda, S)$) $w_0 \Lambda^- = \Lambda w_0 = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^- J_r\}$.

(11) Consider any $r \in O$ and $s \in H_r$. Then $r \leq^\varepsilon s$. By Corollary 4.8 we know that $w_0 r w_0 \leq^{-\varepsilon} w_0 s w_0$. Since $s \in H_r \Leftrightarrow w_0 s w_0 \in H_{w_0 r w_0}$ we conclude that $w_0 r w_0 \in O$ as well. But then $w_0 O w_0 = O$ and hence $w_0 O = O w_0$ It remains to show that these elements are maximum in their $\mathscr{H}$-classes.

Consider an arbitrary $r \in O$ and any element $s \in H_r$. Let $r = xey$ and $s = zey$ be written in left standard form. Then $w_0 r = (w_0 x)^{\lambda^*(e)} ey$ and $w_0 s = (w_0 z)^{\lambda_*(e)} ey$, So it is clear that $w_0 s \mathscr{H} w_0 r$ if and only if $s \mathscr{H} r$. We can observe the following equivalences, $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $x \leq z$ if and only if $w_0 z \leq w_0 x$ if and only if $(w_0 z)^{\lambda_*(e)} \leq (w_0 x)^{\lambda_*(e)}$ if and only if $w_0 s \leq^+ w_0 r$. This allows us to conclude that $w_0 O = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^+ H_r\}$. A similar chain of equivalences shows $O w_0 = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r = max^- H_r\}$.

(12) This is similar to Theorem 3.8. We will just handle the $\mathcal{N}^+$ case, as the rest have similar reasoning. From the definition it is clear that $r, s \in \mathcal{N}^+$ and $r \mathscr{J} s$ implies that $r \leq^+ s$ and $s \leq^+ r$, hence $r = s$. It remains to show that each $\mathscr{J}$-class has a minimum. However, in the preceeding theorem, we contructed $min^+ J_r$ by its vanilla form from an arbitrary element $r \in \mathcal{R}$. So since for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $|J_r \cap \mathcal{N}^+| = 1$ we conclude $\mathcal{N}^+ \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{J}$. □

In fact, the proof of our last result can be extended to show the following corollary.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $\varepsilon = +$ or $-$ and let $r \leq^\varepsilon s \in \mathcal{R}$*

(1) If $r \mathscr{L} s$ then $w_0 r \mathscr{L} w_0 s$ and $w_0 s \leq^\varepsilon w_0 r$

(2) If $r \mathscr{R} s$ then $r w_0 \mathscr{R} s w_0$ and $s w_0 \leq^\varepsilon r w_0$

Proof. We shall just prove (1) with $\varepsilon = +$ as the others are done simiarly. Let $r = xey$ and $s = zey$ be written in left standard form. Then $w_0 r = (w_0 x)^{\lambda^*(e)} ey$ and $w_0 s = (w_0 z)^{\lambda_*(e)} ey$, So it is clear that $w_0 s \mathscr{L} w_0 r$ since $r \mathscr{L} s$. We can observe the following equivalences, $r \leq^+ s$ if and only if $x \leq z$ if and only if $w_0 z \leq w_0 x$ if and only if $(w_0 z)^{\lambda_*(e)} \leq (w_0 x)^{\lambda_*(e)}$ if and only if $w_0 s \leq^+ w_0 r$. This concludes the result. □

The absolute elements of a $\mathscr{T}$-class can in some sense be considered as indicators of the ordering of the $\mathscr{T}$-classes in the whole poset, $(\mathcal{R}, \leq^\varepsilon)$. This next theorem showcases this result.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$ be arbitrary elements and suppose $\mathscr{T}$ is an equivalence relation. Consider the following statements:*

(1) $min^\varepsilon T_r \leq^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_s$

(2) $max^\varepsilon T_r \leq^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_s$

(3) There exist $a \in T_r$ and $b \in T_s$ so that $a \leq^\varepsilon b$

If $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{J}$, $\mathscr{L}$, or $\mathscr{R}$ then all three are equivalent. If $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{H}$ then only (2) and (3) are equivalent.

Proof. Since $min^\varepsilon T_r \mathscr{T} r \mathscr{T} max^\varepsilon T_r$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we can quickly see that (2) implies (3).

Case $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{J}$: Let $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ and $s = \tau_- f_- \tau_0 f_+ \tau_+$ be written in vanilla form. By using Theorem 5.3 we can notice $min^+ J_r = \left({}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0^{\lambda(e_-)}\right) e_- \left({}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda(e_+)}\right) e_+ \left({}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0^{\lambda(e_-)}\right)$, $min^+ J_s = \left({}^{\lambda(f_+)}w_0^{\lambda(f_-)}\right) f_- \left({}^{\lambda(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda(f_+)}\right) f_+ \left({}^{\lambda(f_+)}w_0^{\lambda(f_-)}\right)$, $max^+ J_r = 1 e_- \left({}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)}\right) e_+ 1$, and $max^+ J_s = 1 f_- \left({}^{\lambda_*(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)}\right) f_+ 1$.

Suppose (1) is true. Then $min^+ J_r \leq^+ min^+ J_s$ implies that $e_- \leq f_-$ and $e_+ \leq f_+$. It follows that $\lambda_*(f_-) \subseteq \lambda_*(e_-)$ and $\lambda_*(f_+) \subseteq \lambda_*(e_+)$ and so, $\left({}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)}\right) \leq \left({}^{\lambda_*(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)}\right)$. But it is exactly this condition that shows us that $max^+ J_r \leq^+ max^+ J_s$.

Suppose (3). Without loss of generality we may assume $a = r$ and $b = s$. It follows from $r \leq^+ s$ that $e_- \leq f_-$ (hence $\lambda_*(f_-) \subseteq \lambda_*(e_-)$ and $\lambda^*(e_-) \subseteq \lambda^*(f_-)$) and $e_+ \leq f_+$ (hence $\lambda_*(f_+) \subseteq \lambda_*(e_+)$ and $\lambda^*(e_+) \subseteq \lambda^*(f_+)$). By Theorem 1.5 we can see that there exist $c \in W_{\lambda^*(f_+)}$, $d \in W_{\lambda_*(f_+)}$ so that ${}^{\lambda(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda(f_+)} = w_0^{\lambda(f_+)} = w_0 cd$, exist $a \in W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$, $b \in W_{\lambda^*(e_+)}$ so that ${}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} = w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} = w_0 ab$, exist $\gamma \in W_{\lambda^*(f_-)}$, $\delta \in W_{\lambda_*(f_-)}$ so that ${}^{\lambda(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda(f_+)} = {}^{\lambda(f_-)}w_0 = \delta\gamma w_0$, and exist $\alpha \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)}$, $\beta \in W_{\lambda^*(e_-)}$ so that ${}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} = {}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0 = \beta\alpha w_0$.

Then we can observe (after some minor rearrangement of the above) that ${}^{\lambda(f_+)}w_0^{\lambda(f_-)}(\gamma^{-1}\beta)(\delta^{-1}\alpha) = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0^{\lambda(e_-)}$, ${}^{\lambda(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda(e_+)} = (\alpha - 1\delta)(\beta^{-1}\gamma)\left({}^{\lambda(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda(f_+)}\right)(cb^{-1})(da^{-1})$, and $(ad^{-1})(bc^{-1})^{\lambda(f_+)}w_0^{\lambda(f_-)} = {}^{\lambda(e_+)}w_0^{\lambda(e_-)}$, which tells us that $min^+ J_r \leq min^+ J_s$.

Case $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{L}$: Let $r = \sigma e_+ \sigma_+$ and $s = \tau f_+ \tau_+$ be written in left standard form. By using Theorem 5.3 we can notice $min^+ L_r = 1 e_+ \sigma_+$, $min^+ L_s = 1 f_+ \tau_+$, $max^+ L_r = w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)} e_+ \sigma_+$, and $max^+ L_s = w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)} f_+ \tau_+$.

Suppose (1) is true. Then $min^+ L_r \leq^+ min^+ L_s$ implies that $e_+ \leq f_+$ and there exists $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(f_+)} W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ so that $1 \leq 1 w_+$ and $w_+^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. It follows that $\lambda_*(f_+) \subseteq \lambda_*(e_+)$ and so, $w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)} \leq w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)}$. Let $w_+ = uv$ where $u \in W_{\lambda_*(f_+)}$ and $v \in W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$. Then ${}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}(\tau_+) \leq {}^{\lambda_*(e_+)}(u^{-1}\tau_+) \leq v^{-1}u^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$ so we can find $w \in W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ so that $w^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. Noting as well that $w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)} \leq w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)} w$ it follows that $max^+ L_r \leq^+ max^+ L_s$.

Suppose (3). Without loss of generality we may assume $a = r$ and $b = s$. It follows from $r \leq^+ s$ that $e_+ \leq f_+$ and there exists $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(f_+)} W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ so that $\sigma \leq \tau w_+$ and $w_+^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. It is a quick follow-up to observe that

$1 \leq w_+ = 1w_+$ and $w_+^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$, thus $min^+L_r \leq min^+L_s$.

Case $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{R}$: Is nearly identical to the $\mathscr{L}$ case.

Case $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{H}$: Let $r = \sigma_- e_- \sigma_0 e_+ \sigma_+$ and $s = \tau_- f_- \tau_0 f_+ \tau_+$ be written in vanilla form. By using Theorem 5.3 we can notice $min^+H_r = \sigma_- e_- \left(\lambda^{(e_-)} w_0^{\lambda(e_+)}\right) e_+ \sigma_+$, $min^+H_s = \tau_- f_- \left(\lambda^{(f_-)} w_0^{\lambda(f_+)}\right) f_+ \tau_+$, $max^+H_r = \sigma_- e_- \left(\lambda_*(e_-) w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)}\right) e_+ \sigma_+$, and $max^+H_s = \tau_- f_- \left(\lambda_*(f_-) w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)}\right) f_+ \tau_+$.

Suppose (3). As we have been doing, we will just assume $a = r$ and $b = s$. We can find $w_- \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)} W_{\lambda^*(f_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda^*(f_+)} W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$ so that $\tau_- w_-^{-1} \leq \sigma_-$ and $w_+^{-1}\tau_+ \leq \sigma_+$. Like above we can assume that $w_- \in W_{\lambda_*(e_-)}$ and $w_+ \in W_{\lambda_*(e_+)}$. As well, we also know that $\lambda_*(f_-) \subseteq \lambda_*(e_-)$ and $\lambda_*(f_+) \subseteq \lambda_*(e_+)$. Thus ${}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)} \leq {}^{\lambda_*(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)}$ and hence ${}^{\lambda_*(e_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(e_+)} \leq w_-\,{}^{\lambda_*(f_-)}w_0^{\lambda_*(f_+)} w_+$. This shows us that $max^+H_r \leq^+ max^+H_s$. □

The inspiration for our look at minimum elements in equivalence classes comes from Section 5 in [4] where a number of results, noteably Corollary 5.5, deal with the properties of the elements of O inside their $\mathscr{H}$-classes. Were it not for this section, the author's PhD thesis would not have taken the direction it did, and consequently this paper would not have been written as a combinatorial follow up.

It is somewhat ironic that the result this work was inspired by, Corollary 5.5 in [4], actually states that $r \leq^+ s$ implies $min^+H_r \leq^+ min^+H_s$, which one may notice was exactly the statement that had to be left out of the preceeding theorem, as it is not correct.

Example 5.7. *Consider the elements of the* 3×3 *Rook monoid with the usual Adherence order given by the invertible upper triangular matrices,* $r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ *and* $s = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. *Then* $r \leq^+ s$ *but* $min^+H_r \not\leq^+ min^+H_s$. *Indeed,* $min^+H_r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ *and* $min^+H_s = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

As a consequence of this theorem, we can show that chains in $\mathcal{R}$ do not wander in and out of equivalence classes. In a sense, equivalence classes are their own self-contained bubbles when it comes to our Adherence orders.

Corollary 5.8. *Suppose that we have an equivalence relation* $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{J}, \mathscr{L}, \mathscr{R}$, *or* $\mathscr{H}$, *and a chain of elements,* $r_0 \leq^\varepsilon r_1 \leq^\varepsilon \cdots \leq^\varepsilon r_n$, *in* $\mathcal{R}$. *Then* $r_0 \mathscr{T} r_n$ *implies that* $r_0 \mathscr{T} r_i$ *for all* i.

Proof. Using Theorem 5.6 we can see that our chain condition implies $max^\varepsilon T_{r_0} \leq^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_{r_1} \leq^\varepsilon \cdots \leq^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_{r_n}$. But since $r_0 \mathscr{T} r_n$ we see that $T_{r_0} = T_{r_n}$ and hence $max^\varepsilon T_{r_0} \leq^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_{r_1} \leq^\varepsilon \cdots \leq^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_{r_0}$. So by squeezing we see that $min^\varepsilon T_{r_0} = max^\varepsilon T_{r_i}$ for all i. By definition, $s \mathscr{T} max^\varepsilon T_s$ for all $s \in \mathcal{R}$ we conclude that $r_0 \mathscr{T} r_i$ for all i. □

6 Geometric Interpretations

The scope of the generalized Renner-Coxeter systems is indeed impressive and allows us to consider the theory of monoids of Lie type, Renner monoids of reductive algebraic monoids, and Renner monoids created from Kac-Moody groups. However, let us take a moment and look at the implications of our definitions and results when confined to Renner monoids of reductive algebraic monoids.

Such Renner monoids are always finite, so everything we have dealt with in this paper applies. In a Renner monoid, the Adherence order corresponds exactly to our definition of $\leq^+$ (Corollary 1.5 in [4]). This fact, along with the knowledge that all Renner monoids coming from reductive monoids are finite (Proposition 3.2.1 in [6]) means that the vanilla form and all the results we have derived from it now apply.

For the ease of our notation, we will rebrand our Borel subgroup as $B^+ = B$ and our irreducible reductive monoid, M with group of units G.

Theorem 6.1.

(1) $B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon = \bigsqcup_{s\in T_r} B^\varepsilon s B^\varepsilon$ is an irreducible variety.

(2) $B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$ is the unique dense orbit of $B^\varepsilon \times B^\varepsilon$ on $B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$.

(3) $B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$ is the unique closed orbit of $B^\varepsilon \times B^\varepsilon$ on $B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$.

Proof. (1) The individual cases when $\varepsilon = +$ are covered in [3] in Section 4. The B^- cases can be derived through nearly identical reasoning.

(2) By definition we know, $max^\varepsilon T_r \mathscr{T} r$ so we can see that $B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon \subseteq B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$. It follows from there, $\overline{B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} \subseteq \overline{B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} = \bigcup_{s\in T_r} \overline{B^\varepsilon s B^\varepsilon} \subseteq \bigcup_{s\in T_r} \overline{B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} = \overline{B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon}$.

(3) Suppose that $s \in \overline{B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} \cap B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon = \bigsqcup_{t\in T_r} \overline{B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} \cap B^\varepsilon t B^\varepsilon$. If $s \in \overline{B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} \cap B^\varepsilon t B^\varepsilon$ then $\overline{B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} \cap B^\varepsilon t B^\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$, and hence $t \leq^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r$. However, by definition this means $t = min^\varepsilon T_r$. Thus $\overline{B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} \cap B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon = B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$, hence $B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$ is a closed orbit. By similar analysis, we can see that for any other orbit in $B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$, $B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$ will always be contained in its closure, making $B^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon$ the only closed orbit. □

Proposition 6.2. *Let us define a new relation on the $\mathscr{T}$-classes of $\mathcal{R}$. $T_r \leq^\varepsilon_{\mathscr{T}} T_s$ if and only if $B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon \subseteq \overline{B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon}$. Like $B^\varepsilon r B^\varepsilon \subseteq \overline{B^\varepsilon s B^\varepsilon}$, $\leq^\varepsilon_{\mathscr{T}}$ can be shown to be a partial order on the $\mathscr{T}$-classes of $\mathcal{R}$. Consider the following statements:*

(1) $min^\varepsilon T_r \leq^\varepsilon min^\varepsilon T_s$

(2) $max^\varepsilon T_r \leq^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_s$

(3) there exist $a \in T_r$ and $b \in T_s$ with $a \leq^\varepsilon b$

(4) $T_r \leq^\varepsilon_{\mathscr{T}} T_s$

If $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{J}$, $\mathscr{L}$, or $\mathscr{R}$ then all four are equivalent. If $\mathscr{T} = \mathscr{H}$ the only the last three are equivalent.

Proof. The equivalence of (2) and (3) (and (1) is $\mathscr{T} \neq \mathscr{H}$) has already been established by Theorem 5.6. Suppose (2). Then $max^\varepsilon T_r \leq^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_s$ if and only if $B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon \subseteq \overline{B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_s B^\varepsilon}$. However, by Theorem 6.1 we can then see that this implies $B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon \subseteq \overline{B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} = \overline{B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon} \subseteq \overline{B^\varepsilon max^\varepsilon T_s B^\varepsilon} = \overline{B^\varepsilon T_s B^\varepsilon}$ which is (4).

Supposing (4) then, $\bigsqcup_{u\mathscr{T}r} B^\varepsilon u B^\varepsilon = B^\varepsilon T_r B^\varepsilon \subseteq \overline{B^\varepsilon T_s B^\varepsilon} = \overline{\bigsqcup_{v\mathscr{T}s} B^\varepsilon v B^\varepsilon} = \bigsqcup_{v\mathscr{T}s} \overline{B^\varepsilon v B^\varepsilon} = \bigsqcup_{w\leq^\varepsilon v, v\mathscr{T}s} B^\varepsilon w B^\varepsilon$. This means we can find $a\mathscr{T}r$ and $c \leq^\varepsilon b\mathscr{T}s$ so that $BaB \cap BcB \neq \emptyset$. However, this condition is true exactly when $a = c$ (Theorem 8.3 in [9]) and so $a \leq^\varepsilon b$, showing (3). □

$\leq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathscr{T}}$ represents a generalization of $\leq^{\varepsilon}$. Indeed, for the equivalence relation of equality, we see $\leq^{\varepsilon}=\leq^{\varepsilon}_{=}$. This Adherence order on $\mathscr{T}$-classes lets us bridge the gap between equality and the usual partial order on $\mathscr{J}$-classes, as both are examples of these $\leq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathscr{T}}$ relations. Indeed, $J_r \subseteq \mathcal{R}J_s\mathcal{R}$ if and only if $J_r \leq^{+}_{\mathscr{J}} J_s$ if and only if $J_r \leq^{-}_{\mathscr{J}} J_s$.

Using our Borel subgroups, we can recognize our absolute minimum elements in a more geometric way.

Proposition 6.3. *Pick $\varepsilon = +$ or $-$. Then,*

(1) $\mathcal{GT}^{\varepsilon} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid B^{\varepsilon}r \subseteq rB^{\varepsilon}\} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid B^{\varepsilon}rB^{\varepsilon} = rB^{\varepsilon}\}$

(2) $\mathcal{TG}^{\varepsilon} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid rB^{\varepsilon} \subseteq B^{\varepsilon}r\} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid B^{\varepsilon}rB^{\varepsilon} = B^{\varepsilon}r\}$

(3) $\mathcal{N}^{\varepsilon} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid B^{\varepsilon}r = rB^{\varepsilon}\}$

(4) $\mathcal{O}^{\varepsilon} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r^*B^{\varepsilon}r \subseteq r^*rB^{\varepsilon}\} = \{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid rB^{\varepsilon}r^* \subseteq B^{\varepsilon}rr^*\}$

Proof. (1) and (2) $\mathcal{GT}^{+}$ can be found to be equivalent to both sets by Section 9 in [6]. The other three sets of absolute minimums are found by analogous work.

(3) This is a combination of (1) and (2) as $\mathcal{N}^{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{GT}^{\varepsilon} \cap \mathcal{TG}^{\varepsilon}$.

(4) It is clear from the definitions of these sets that $\mathcal{GT}^{+}$, $\mathcal{GT}^{-}$, $\mathcal{TG}^{+}$, and $\mathcal{TG}^{-}$ are subsets. It is also clear that these two sets are monoids. In [7] with Corollary 2.3 these sets are shown to be equal and further results show that they form a monoid. By Theorem 2.8 of that same paper, it is noted that these sets are equal to $\mathcal{R}/\mathscr{H}$. However, the $\mathcal{O}$ we defined in this paper is the smallest monoid containing $\mathcal{GT}^{+}$, $\mathcal{GT}^{-}$, $\mathcal{TG}^{+}$, and $\mathcal{TG}^{-}$ and also has the property that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{R}/\mathscr{H}$. It follows that these sets indeed describe $\mathcal{O}$. □

Infact, it is Renner's work in [6] from which $\mathcal{GT}^{+}$ gets is symbol, as these are the **Gauss-Jordan** elements of the Renner monoid. The symbol $\mathcal{GT}$ appears in other work, such as [8] where it is used to define $\mathcal{TG}^{+}$ instead. This is only a cosmetic difference, but is still noteworthy to those who wish to read both papers. Simiarly, $\mathcal{O}$ gets its symbol from [7] as it contains the set of **order-preserving** elements of $\mathcal{R}$.

Combining this most recent result with Proposition 6.2 we can simplify the assessment of $\leq_{\mathscr{L}}$ and $\leq_{\mathscr{R}}$.

Corollary 6.4.

(1) For $r, s \in \mathcal{GT}^{\varepsilon}$ then $L_r \leq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathscr{L}} L_s$ if and only if $rB^{\varepsilon} \subseteq \overline{sB^{\varepsilon}}$.

(2) For $r, s \in \mathcal{TG}^{\varepsilon}$ then $R_r \leq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathscr{R}} R_s$ if and only if $B^{\varepsilon}r \subseteq \overline{B^{\varepsilon}s}$.

Proof. (1) $L_r \leq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathscr{L}} L_s$ if and only if $r = min^{\varepsilon}L_r \leq^{\varepsilon} min^{\varepsilon}L_s = s$ if and only if $rB^{\varepsilon} = B^{\varepsilon}rB^{\varepsilon} \subseteq \overline{B^{\varepsilon}sB^{\varepsilon}} = \overline{sB^{\varepsilon}}$. (2) is done similarly. □

There is certainly much more work that can be done with Renner-Coxeter systems. They provide a solely combinatorial platform from which to investigate a traditionally algebraic and geometric structure. As a generalization of Coxeter systems, the overlap and extensions of results from [1] are definitely worth exploring and cataloguing.

The author wishes to thank Lex Renner for his time in discussions and his guidance on the creation of this paper and the research that lead to its completion.

References

[1] A. Björner and F. Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter Groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 231, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.

[2] E. Godelle, *Generic Hecke algebra for Renner monoids*, Journal of Algebra 343, 224-247(2011)

[3] A. O'Hara, *A Study Of Greens Relations On Algebraic Semigroups*, (2015). Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. Paper 3047. http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/3047

[4] E. Pennell, M. Putcha, L. Renner, *Analogue of the Bruhat-Chevalley Order for Reductive Monoids*, Journal of Algebra 196, 339-368, 1997.

[5] M. Putcha, *Bruhat-Chevalley Order in Reductive Monoids*, Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics 20(2004), 33-53

[6] L. Renner, *Analogue of the Bruhat decomposition for algebraic monoids*, Journal of Algebra 101, 303-338, 1986.

[7] L. Renner, *Analogue of the Bruhat decomposition for algebraic monoids II: the length function and trichotomy*, Journal of Algebra 175, 697-714, 1995.

[8] L. Renner, *Descent Systems for Bruhat Posets*, Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics, 29, 413-435, 2009.

[9] L. Renner, *Linear Algebraic Monoids*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 134, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.